DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 477 HE 032 068

AUTHOR	Chalmers, Anna
TITLE	Workload and Stress in New Zealand Universities. A Follow Up to the 1994 Study.
INSTITUTION	New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.; Association of Univ. Staff of New Zealand, Wellington.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	116p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New Zealand Council for Educational Research, P.O. Box 3237, Wellington, New Zealand.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Faculty Workload; Followup Studies; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Quality of Working Life; Questionnaires; Stress Variables; Surveys; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This follow-up study surveyed members of the Association of University Staff of New Zealand concerning their workload and stress levels and compared findings to a similar survey conducted in 1994. Survey responses (n=1155) were analyzed in terms of employment status, work hours, salary, responsibilities, changes and their impact, stresses and pressures, improvements, and issues. Overall, the situation in 1998 reflects a continuum of responses toward earlier changes and their effects, rather than to new changes bringing new impacts. Changes continue to be more negative than positive for staff; stress effects on staff worsened by 1998, with more staff reporting a work-related illness or injury than in 1994. Most staff reported detrimental rather than improved effects on six aspects of their personal, family, and work lives. Few differences between 1994 and 1998 were found in the following areas: number of hours worked by all groups; employment status of most staff; the continued increase in work demands; continued dissatisfaction with university restructuring, student numbers, and demands; high stress levels of academic staff; dissatisfaction with the time available for research; and dissatisfaction with salaries. Appended are tables detailing responses, the questionnaires used, and sample responses to open-ended questions. (Contains 27 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 477

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Webber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WORKLOAD AND STRESS IN NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES IN 1998

A FOLLOW-UP TO THE 1994 STUDY

ANNA CHALMERS

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
and
The Association of University Staff of New Zealand
Wellington
1998

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

The Association of University Staff of New Zealand
PO Box 11-767
Wellington
New Zealand

© NZCER and AUSNZ, 1998
ISBN 1-877140-53-8

Distributed by NZCER Distribution Services
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 1

INTRODUCTION 5
- Aims of This Study 5
  - Objectives and Research Questions 5
- Background Literature Review 5
  - Workload 5
  - Workload and Stress 6
  - Extent of Workplace Stress 7
  - Position and Workplace Stress 8
  - Gender and Workplace Stress 9
  - Changes in Staff Employment 10
  - Morale and Job Satisfaction 11

SAMPLE DESIGN 13
- Survey Development 13
- Sampling 13
- Interpretation of Tables, Statistics, and Terms 13
- Analysis 14
- Response Characteristics 14
- Sample Representativeness 14

RESULTS

1—EMPLOYMENT STATUS, WORK HOURS, AND SALARY 15
- Employment Status 15
- Average Hours Worked Per Week 18
- Work Outside University Hours 18
- Average Full-time Salaries of Staff 19
  - Employer Contributions to Superannuation 20
- Adequacy of Salary 21
- Summary 22

2—RESPONSIBILITIES 23
- Teaching Responsibilities 23
  - Academic Staff 23
  - Support Staff 23
  - Library Staff 24
  - Technical Staff 24

Student Numbers 24
Workload Responsibilities 25
Academic Staff 25
Support Staff 25
Library Staff 26
Technical Staff 26
Summary 26

3—CHANGES AND THEIR IMPACT 27
Changes to Total Workload 27
Changes to Workload Areas 28
Expected Changes to Workload in the Future 30
Changes to the Number of Requests for Services 30
Support Staff 31
Library Staff 31
Technical Staff 31
Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed 31
Changes to Work Situation 32
Reasons for Changes to Work Situation 33
Balance in Workload 35
Training 35
Impact of Increased Requests for Service on Workload 36
Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed 37
Impact on Personal, Family, and Work Life 37
Summary 38

4—STRESSES AND PRESSURES 41
Current Stress Levels 41
Recent Changes to Stress Levels 41
Expected Changes to Stress Levels in the Future 42
Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses 42
Stress Rating 44
Stress Profile 46
Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Stress 46
Job Satisfaction 47
Summary 48

5—IMPROVEMENTS AND ISSUES 51
Work Improvements 51
Current Issues 52
Summary 53

CONCLUSION 55

REFERENCES 57

APPENDIX A 59
Details of Respondents and Additional Tables 59

APPENDIX B 69
Questionnaires 69
General Staff 70
University Academics 87

APPENDIX C 101
Selected comments from respondents to open-ended questions 101
(i) Academics 101
(ii) Technicians 105
(iii) Support Staff 107
(iv) Library Staff 110

TABLES

1 Type of Contract 15
2 Length of Limited-term Contract 16
3 Total Length of Time in University Employment 16
4 Length of Time in Present Position
5 Average Hours Worked Per Week by Full-time Respondents 18
6 Average Salary of Full-time Respondents 19
7 University Staff Receiving Employer Contributions to Superannuation 20
8 Views of Salary Adequacy in Relation to Work 21
9 Minimum Number of Undergraduates Taught or Assisted in Any One Course 24
10 Maximum Number of Undergraduates Taught or Assisted in Any One Course 25
11 Changes to Total Workload in Recent Years (1994)/Since 1994 (1998) 27
12 Increases to Total Workload in Recent Years (1994)/Since 1994 (1998) by University 28
13 Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases and Decreases to Workload 29
14 Expected Workload Levels in Future (1994 Survey)/in Next 3 Years (1998 survey) 30
15 Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed from 1989 Onwards 32
16 Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement and Deterioration in Their Work Situation in Last 4 Years 33
17 Reasons for Work Situation Changes 34
18 Balance in Workload 35
19 Net Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training 36
20 Impact on Workload of Increase in Requests 36
21 Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed 37
22 Percentage of Respondents Reporting Detrimental Effects 37
23 Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improved Effects on 6 Aspects of their Lives 38

24 Current Work Stress 41
25 Changes to Stress Levels in Recent Years 42
26 Expected Stress Levels in Future 42
27 Respondents Experiencing Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses while in University Employment 43
28 Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses 43
29 Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by 25 Percent or More of Respondents 45
30 Current Levels of Job Satisfaction 47
31 Changes to Levels of Job Satisfaction in Recent Years 47
32 Likelihood of Being in University Employment in 5 Years' Time 48
33 Changes That Would Make Work More Worthwhile Ranked First, Second, or Third by Respondents in 1998 52
34 Current Issues Ranked First, Second, or Third by Respondents in 1998 53

APPENDIX A: LIST OF TABLES

35 Sample Population 59
36 Return Rate by Occupational Group and University 59
37 Ethnicity of Respondents 59
38 Gender of Respondents 60
39 Age of Respondents 60
40 Academics' Area of Speciality 1998 60
41 Representativeness by University 61
42 Representativeness by Gender 61
43 Gender and Academic Positions 61
44a Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases in Workload Areas 62
44b Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Workload Areas 63
44c Percentage of Respondents Reporting Decreases in Workload Areas 64
45a Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement in Work Situation in Last 4 Years 65
45b Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Work Situation in Last 4 Years 66
45c Percentage of Respondents Reporting Deterioration in Work Situation in Last 4 Years 67
46 Balance of Workload 68
47 Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training 68

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to all those AUS members who responded to the trial and final questionnaires; Rob Crozier, Michael Gibbs, and Jan O'Neil of the AUS national office for their assistance; Russell Campbell, Matthew Fitzsimons, and Bill Rosenberg for comments on the draft report; Jane Clendon for coding the questionnaires, Barb Bishop for data analysis, Fay Swann for editing, Roberta Tiatia for secretarial services, Leigh Montford for interloans, Alys Titchener and Beverley Thompson for literature searches and Cathy Wylie for providing expertise, advice and support throughout the project.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- The impact of changes to universities continued to have more negative than positive effects for university staff and their work in 1998.

- The changes have had costs for university staff's health and the quality of their personal lives. More university staff in each of the 4 occupational groups (academics, academic and administrative support staff, librarians, and technicians) reported a work-related illness or injury in 1998 than in 1994.

- Of those reporting a work-related illness or injury, most reported general stress effects (e.g. insomnia), or general illness/feeling run down.

- Respondents were asked to indicate whether changes to their work situation had any effects on the quality of 6 aspects of their lives. Compared to 1994, significantly more academics reported a decrease in the quality of their physical health, and significantly more librarians reported a decrease in the quality of their family life/relationships.

- The changes to universities do not appear to have led to a substantial improvement in the quality of university staff's work, with the possible exception of librarians, where those who considered the quality of their service to have improved outweighed those who thought that the quality of their service had deteriorated. Similar numbers of technicians and support staff believed the quality of their work had either deteriorated or improved. Twice as many academics believed the quality of their teaching and research had deteriorated compared with those who believed it had improved.

- Staff morale and university management were common issues for university staff. While general staff were frustrated with their salary levels, academic staff were frustrated that they could not find time for research.

- Stress levels were higher for those working more hours per week, taking work home or working in the evenings, employed part time, or feeling some insecurity about their employment. Those reporting high stress levels were more likely to be dissatisfied with their job, and feel that their salary did not adequately reflect their job.

- Approximately 40 percent of university staff found their job often or almost always stressful in 1998; there was no change from 1994. More librarians reported these levels of stress than in 1994. Academic stress levels remained the highest of all university staff with 48 percent of academics reporting that they found their job often or almost always stressful in 1998. This was also the case in 1994.

- The content of their work was a source of job satisfaction for many staff. The main sources of work-related stress for many university staff were linked to their work and workload, rather than the contents of their jobs.

- Less than half the present university staff expected to be in university employment in 5 years' time. While slightly more than half of the academics not expecting to be in university employment in 5 years' time expected to have retired by then, more women and those on the lower rungs of the academic ladder or in part-time employment were less positive about their remaining in university employment.

- Causes of stress were mainly related to workload—in particular to the volume of work, and inadequate time to do justice to work—but also to university restructuring, and low morale related to restructuring.

- Most respondents in each of the 4 occupational groups reported that their workload had increased since 1994.

- In 1998, most university staff continued to be employed full time and permanently. Between 1994 and 1998 there was a significant decrease in the percentage of academics employed on a permanent basis, from 87 percent in 1994 to 78 percent in 1998. This was also the case for librarians in 1998, 87 percent of whom were employed on a permanent basis compared with 96 percent in 1994.

- Over all, university staff worked about the same number of hours in 1994 and 1998. Academics (53 hours) and technicians (40 hours) worked the same number of hours per week in both years; full-time support staff worked slightly fewer hours (41) in 1998 than in 1994 (44); and librarians worked about the same number of hours in both years (40 in 1998 and 39 in 1994).

- More librarians were employed part time than other university occupational groups. This was also the case in 1994.

- Most academics (87 percent) reported that they worked in the evening or took work home on 1 evening or more a week compared with a third of support staff and a quarter of technicians and library staff. Most academics (85 percent) reported that they worked on 1 or more weekends a month compared with 15–21 percent of the 3 other occupational groups. The percentages of staff in the 4 occupational groups who worked in the evenings and weekends were very similar to 1994.

- Academics who earned less than $70,000 and technicians who earned less than $50,000 per year were half as likely as the higher paid staff in their occupational group to feel that their salary was adequate. Over all, between a little over half and two-thirds of respondents in each of the 4 occupational groups felt they were inadequately paid.

- There were gender differences in positions held by academic men and women. While there were comparable proportions of male and female professors, generally women were more likely to be in less senior positions. These differences were related to differences in salaries.

- Men had spent longer in university employment than women, and longer in their present position. Men were 3 times as likely as women to have spent more than 20 years in university employment, and twice as likely to have been 9 years or more in their current position. These differences may be related to gender differences in salary.

- There were marked salary differences by gender for full-time staff in the following groups. Female support staff earned $7,000 less than male support staff, female librarians $11,000 less, and female technicians $5,000 less. These differences may be related to differences in length of service and time in present position.

- Female academics earned on average $12,000 a year less than their male colleagues. Some gender differences in salary remained after taking length of service and position into account. Female lecturers who had 6–10 years of academic work experience were less likely than men to earn more than $50,000, and female senior lecturers who had 11–20 years of academic work experience were less likely to earn more than $70,000.

- As in 1994, respondents from all groups (apart from librarians) spent the largest proportion of their time supporting students or staff by either teaching, preparing for teaching, or responding to inquiries or requests. Respondents from all groups also spent between 10 percent (technical staff) and 20 percent (academic staff) of their time on administration—an estimated average across all groups of 16 percent (13 percent in 1994) of staff time.

- Although university staff estimates of the number of hours they spent working per week were much the same in 1998 as they had been in 1994, at least three quarters of respondents regarded their workload as having increased.

- The main areas of increased demands had stayed much the same since 1994: administration, course and lecture planning and student services for academics; services for students and non-contact library duties for librarians; and technical support for teaching and equipment maintenance for technicians. Some of these increased demands may reflect the growing use of information technology (IT) in library work and teaching presentations. Others may reflect the increased administrative workload which comes with devolution and restructuring, the changes to funding which focus on maintaining or increasing student numbers for university departments, and in some areas, reduced staff numbers.

- Most university staff were unhappy with the balance of their current workload. Most would prefer less administrative work. Nearly a quarter of academic staff would like to have more time for research, and spend less time on teaching. Academics and technicians would like to spend more time on research, while support staff and librarians would like to spend more time on providing services directly to users.

- There have been some improvements since 1994 in training for university staff in the areas of everyday job requirements, and new technology. However, staff still considered they had not received adequate training to cope with university restructuring and changes in funding for research.

- Most respondents in 1998 and in 1994 stated that increasing student numbers had increased their workload.

- Some improvements were noted in the quality of university staff's working life since 1994, particularly by academics—these were in resources; work environment (space, lighting, etc.); interactions with colleagues, students, and outside clients; and IT support.

- As in the 1994 survey, university staff were concerned about funding, career prospects, the ability to exercise academic freedom and to take research leave, and working life in general. Compared with the 1994 survey results, there was a notable increase in the proportion of university staff registering a deterioration in the overall management of their university, and in the funding for their work.

INTRODUCTION

Aims of This Study

In 1994, after having been presented with anecdotal evidence that workloads and stress levels were rising for staff in New Zealand universities, the Association of University Staff (AUS) commissioned a survey from NZCER to obtain quantifiable evidence from AUS members about members' workloads and stress levels, in the light of the recent legislative and policy changes to the New Zealand university system. This study resulted in the publication of a research report for the AUS (Boyd & Wylie, 1994).

In 1998, AUS commissioned NZCER to undertake a second survey of their members so that the Council could monitor the current situation by obtaining an up-to-date picture and comparing the results with those of the 1994 survey. As it was intended that the 1998 survey would largely replicate the 1994 survey, the focus has continued to be on issues of workload and stress.

Objectives and Research Questions

Analysis of information from the 1998 survey aims to provide information on, and insights into, the following:

1. A comparison of current levels of workload, hours of work, and responsibilities of AUS members with 1994 findings.

2. Changes in workload levels and content, levels and amount of responsibility, and working relationships for AUS members as a result of major tertiary administration and funding reforms, and the current wave of restructuring.

3. AUS members' current perceptions of connections between workload and stress levels.

4. AUS members' current perceptions about the ways changes in workload and/or educational reforms, and/or industrial relations environment, and/or restructuring have affected the quality of their work.

Background Literature Review

Most of the current research and writing on workload and stress issues in New Zealand and international university settings concentrates on documenting the experiences of academic staff. There is a dearth of literature on the experiences of members of other occupational groups. This disparity is reflected in this overview.

Workload

Studies of workloads have considered increase in hours worked, conflicting demands on staff time, and overload. Wergin (1994) notes in his overview of research on studies in the United States of faculty workload that college faculty members were working harder than ever—a remarkably

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

consistent 55 hours per week from study to study—but were probably teaching less, and they were almost certainly having less contact with students, particularly undergraduates.

The recent survey of 782 academics, and academic-related staff who were members of the United Kingdom Association of University Teachers, found that the mean range of hours of work for respondents was 41–60 with 30 percent working 51–60 hours and 10 percent working more than 60 hours per week. (Kinman, 1998).

Morrison (n.d.) looked at "what gets in the way of" university research time at the University of Auckland's Science and Engineering faculties. He found that teaching load, departmental administration and assessment of students (with the growth of continuous student assessment allied with greater student numbers), and the lack of research funding were the highest ranked factors affecting research time. Morrison suggests that a heavy, and perhaps growing, load of administration on academics is a cause for concern, especially as it is seen to impact on the research roles of academics.

Cassie (1998) reports that enrolment growth at New Zealand universities in 1997 was not matched by academic staff growth, with the average student to staff ratios worsening slightly as a result. The trends varied widely with 3 universities decreasing their number of full-time equivalent academic staff and 4 increasing staff numbers. The average student staff:ratio for the 7 universities was 16.9 compared with 16.7 in the previous year. These figures have possible implications for academic staff workloads.

Workload and Stress

A number of studies have found a relationship between work overload and stress.

In a study of staff at the University of Birmingham, Harrison (1997) found that 88 percent of both academic and administrative staff and 83 percent of manual staff, 82 percent of clerical staff, and 77 percent of technical staff identified a general increase in workload as a reason for rising stress levels, making it the major concern. In a study of full-time tenure-track teachers in the California State University system, Blix, Cruise, Mitchell, and Blix (1994) found that a heavy workload was the most commonly cited reason for considering a job change.

Smith, Anderson, and Lovrich (1995) studied multiple sources of staff stress at a land-grant university faculty in the United States, and reported that "a significant number of university faculty, are indeed experiencing and reporting stress in the workplace. Work overload is a major contributor to this problem." In a study of Tennesse State University faculty members, Stewart and Spence (1996) examined the relationship of faculty morale in relation to satisfaction with workload (amongst other factors) and found a significant negative relationship.

Gmelch and Burns (1994) of Washington State University studied sources of stress in a sample of academic department chairpersons. The sample was drawn from the research and doctorate-granting institutions classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The authors found that the highest mean scoring item in the task-based stress group was a too-heavy workload. Daniels and Guppy (1994) conducted an exploratory study of stress and psychological well-being in British university lecturing, research, and support staff and found that academic staff reported more workload (have too much work to do) and managerial stressors but fewer role stressors. Secretarial/clerical staff and technical/engineering staff were found to report more role stressors. Research staff and senior administrative staff reported fewer role stressors than support staff but

more than academics.

Kinman (1998) found a strong relationship between hours worked per week, self-reported stress, and psychological wellbeing. As working hours increased stress levels rose, and levels of psychological wellbeing decreased.

By far the lowest levels of psychological well-being were found amongst those working in excess of 60 hours per week. Reported stress levels were also linked with the extent of time spent working during the evenings and weekends.

Dey (1994) found that time pressures and lack of personal time were by far the most common sources of stress for respondents in a national survey of full-time United States university and college faculty and administrators. The next most commonly reported sources of stress were faculty teaching loads, publishing and research demands, and review/promotion processes.

Thorsen (1996) also found that it was the quantity rather than the nature of the academic work which caused stress. Teaching was the least stressful of the work functions and research—specifically "finding time for my research"—the most stressful. Long hours on the job and tasks which had a time constraint were significant sources of stress for this sample of full-time faculty members in 4 areas of study in 4 Ontario universities. Mean and median for the number of hours spent on academic work per week was 50 hours.

Currie (1996) reviewed the literature regarding the changing nature of academic work, and suggests that what may be frustrating academics today is institutional demands for other forms of work that disrupt their primary work of teaching and research. Academics are losing their autonomy and are having to wrestle with how to use their time most productively because of the demands upon their time being made by "administrivia". They experience themselves "losing that internal rhythm to their lives which allows them to be creative and reflective about ideas".

Abouserie (1996) found that academic staff at the University of Wales College of Cardiff rated work as the most significant cause of stress in their lives (74 percent). Conducting research was the main cause of stress at work (40 percent) followed by time constraints (40 percent). Conducting research emerges as the major cause of stress at work, due to increasing demand for research and the competitive atmosphere among staff, both within departments and between departments. Abouserie's findings are consistent with those of Fisher (as cited in Boyd & Wylie, 1994), who indicated that academics engaged in research experience a high degree of worry and distress.

Extent of Workplace Stress

Stress is a characteristic of life and is not inherently destructive. However, prolonged stress is known to be damaging to physical and psychological well-being, and therefore workplace stress has been the subject of a number of studies.

Kinman (1998) found that 1 in 4 respondents said they had taken time off work for stress-related illness in the preceding 12 months. Fifty-three percent of respondents obtained scores on the general health questionnaire indicating borderline levels of depression and anxiety.

In a United States study of burnout among bibliographic instruction librarians in New England, Affleck (1996) found 53 percent of respondents reporting high burnout in 1 dimension of the syndrome, and 9 percent showing high burnout in all 3 dimensions (emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and lack of personal accomplishment). Affleck concluded that role conflict

contributed to the emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation dimensions of burnout.

In his study of stress levels among academic, administrative, clerical, technical, and manual staff groups at the University of Birmingham, Harrison (1997) found that 72 percent of respondents reported that their job had become more stressful in recent years. The main issues were common to all groups and included excessive workload, lack of resources, too many minor tasks, job insecurity and ambiguity, concerns about communication and consultation, and feeling undervalued. Pay rates did not seem to feature.

Abouserie (1996) found that 74 percent of academic staff fell into the moderate stress category and 10 percent the serious stress category, while Blix et al. (1994) found that 66 percent of teachers reported they perceived stress at work at least 50 percent of the time. Teachers who had been teaching for more than 20 years reported least work stress. Emotional exhaustion was the component of burnout that seemed to be most critical in the sample studied. Teachers who rated high on emotional exhaustion had higher work stress scores, experienced more health problems as a result of stress, reported less satisfaction with teaching, felt less productive at work, felt less able to cope with job stress, and were most likely to consider job change. Teachers reported significantly higher work stress than their administrative counterparts.

In a survey of staff at the University of New England, New South Wales, Dua (1994) found that 82 percent of respondents experienced more than 7 job stressors and 51 percent experienced more than 11 job stressors. The study found that both high job stress and high non-work stress were associated with more job dissatisfaction, psychological distress, negative effect, manifest anxiety, absence from work due to illness, doctor visits and illness, and worse physical health.

Smith, Anderson, and Lovrich (1995) focused on 3 areas of workplace stressors: task-based stress, role-based stress, and person-/system-based stress. The authors found that, controlling for other factors, a member of the teaching faculty who reported exhibiting the average amount of Type A behaviour (intensity, impatience, and commonly suffering from some kind of inner turmoil) would be 10 times more likely to experience task-based stress than the faculty member who reported the minimum amount of Type A behaviour.

Position and Workplace Stress

Abouserie (1996) found there were significant differences in stress levels between groups. Lecturers were the most stressed group, followed by senior lecturers, then research assistants and tutors. Readers and professors were the least stressed groups. Oshagbemi (1998) found lecturers were the least satisfied with their jobs, followed by senior lecturers and readers, with professors being the most satisfied.

Gmelch and Burns (1994) refer to the Janus position or dual roles of department chairs as both faculty and administrators. Questionnaires and stress logs were used to obtain data from a sample of academic chairpersons. The conflict-mediating factor was found to be the most stressful. The 3 items which make up this factor are ranked with the most stressful item listed first. The items were "obtaining programme approval and support", "complying with rules and regulations", and "resolving differences with/amongst colleagues". The second most stressful factor was task-based stress, and the third most stressful factor was professional identity stress. The authors state that the results of the study indicate that, over all, stress among department chairs appears to be monolithic in its effect. The Janus posture of the department-chair stress was reinforced by high

stress loadings in both faculty and administrative areas of concern.

Sarros, Gmelch, and Tanewski (1997) examined the role of the academic department head in Australian universities and compared the data with a similar American-based study by Gmelch and Miskin in 1993. Findings indicate a job where role stress is significantly associated with chair stress, and negatively associated with job satisfaction.

Gender and Workplace Stress

There is conflicting evidence as to whether gender plays a part in academics' experience of stress. This evidence is summarised below.

Four studies reported no difference between men and women. Abouserie (1996) found that there were no significant differences between males and females in stress levels. Stewart and Spence (1996) found that there was no relationship between level of morale and race, sex, academic rank, or salary, and Gmelch and Burns (1994) found no significant relationships between gender and the stress factors in their study of academic chairs. Kinman (1998) found that there were no significant differences between men and women in patterns of psychological wellbeing or reported stress levels; nor were there gender differences in terms of expectations of future job-related stress.

Two studies reported more stress amongst male academics. Dua (1994) found no significant difference in job stress between males and females, but males reported more workload stress than females, and females reported more stress due to work politics than males. Currie (1996) also found more stress in men than women. More males than females reported more stress. Currie suggests that this may be related to the fact that more of the women were located at the lower ranks where the levels of responsibility are not quite as great, although the teaching loads may be heavier.

By contrast, 5 studies found more stress amongst women. Dey (1994) found that more women academics were stressed than men on 16 out of 18 listed stressors, particularly with regard to time pressures, lack of personal time, teaching load, and managing household responsibilities. Thorsen (1996) found that women experienced more occupational stress than did their male colleagues. Female respondents had significantly higher mean scores on both the Occupational Stress Inventory (total inventory) and on the subsection dealing with institutional duties.

Smith, Anderson, and Lovrich (1995) found that faculty women in a single institutional setting experienced more work-related stress than their male colleagues when controlling for other important factors. Sources of stress among women faculty were related to role specification and conflict, but were not limited to these aspects. Women were more likely to experience task-based stress as well.

Blix et al. (1994) found that female teachers had significantly higher mean stress scores than did male teachers and nearly one-third of female teachers indicated that they had considered changing jobs during the previous years because of work stress compared with only 9 percent of males.

For their study of occupational stress among African American teaching faculty in predominantly white institutions, Thompson and Dey (1998) analysed data from all African American respondents to a national survey of college faculty and administrators conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at University of California, Los Angeles, in 1992. The most common sources of stress were experienced in the areas of time constraints, promotion

concerns, and overall stress. Women faculty in universities as well as 4-year colleges experienced greater levels of stress than men in all areas, but significantly more in the 2 most common areas, time constraints and promotion concerns. Moreover, regardless of the type of institution, women experienced significantly more stress than their male counterparts.

The authors classified variables into 3 basic categories—professional status, home support and work experiences. Men were more likely to be full professors than assistant professors or lecturers, have doctoral degrees, have higher salaries, and be tenured. Men were more likely to have supportive home networks than women and to spend more time on scholarly endeavours of the kind to be rewarded in the promotion process and to have more publications of all types.

With regard to job satisfaction, Oshagbemi (1998) investigated the impact of age, including age interacting with gender and/or rank, on the job satisfaction of university teachers in the United Kingdom. Oshagbemi found that female university teachers were generally more satisfied with their jobs than male university teachers. Kinman (1998) found significant gender differences in perceived job satisfaction with male respondents, on average, reporting that they gained less satisfaction from their jobs than females.

In examining the role of female/male wage differentials in a model of job satisfaction, Hagedorn (1996) utilised data from the 1989 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching national survey of faculty. The findings indicated that as gender-based wage differentials increased, global job satisfaction of female faculty decreased. This effect was manifested predominantly through faculty perceptions of the institution. As the amount of wage differential increased, women were less inclined to remain in universities. Tenure made no difference to this finding.

Campus Review ("If you're male", 1998) reported that Australian female lecturers aged 45 to 49 earned 78 percent of the salary a similarly aged and qualified male might earn, and suggested that the higher education system is systematically biased against women, with women either dropping out of the academic workforce or putting their careers on hold between the ages of 30 and 45. Promotion pathways are heavily skewed in favour of men who are usually not obliged to leave the workforce to rear children. The figures show female lecturers aged between 20 and 24 years earned 90.5 percent of the equivalent male income, dropping to 83 percent in the late 30s and further between 45 and 49 years, as reported above.

The Times Higher Education Supplement (Gold, 1998) reported that 8.1 percent of United Kingdom professors were women compared with 6.7 percent in 1995, but that 6 out of every 7 new professors appointed since 1995 were male. During this time women overtook men in the rate of appointment as senior lecturers, principal lecturers, or readers, when twice as many women as men were appointed to these positions.

Changes in Staff Employment

The Times Higher Education Supplement ("Going casual", 1998) reported that, between 1980 and 1996, the percentage of teaching and research staff working in United Kingdom universities on fixed-term or hourly paid contracts doubled from 20 percent to 42 percent.

The University of Canterbury Students' Association 1996 survey of postgraduate students (Cassie, 1997) found that the number of women employed as teaching assistants had not increased significantly since 1994, up from 35 percent to 39 percent, and 61 percent of respondents who were teaching had received no training. Only just over half of those employed had been given

information about the university's standard pay rates for teaching assistants.

Morale and Job Satisfaction

Stewart and Spence (1996) investigated the level of morale among faculty at Tennesse State University, and found that morale was affected by perceived opportunities to conduct research. They found that high faculty salaries did not guarantee high morale. Dissatisfaction with workload and poor working conditions were related to low morale.

Leckie and Brett (1997) studied the job satisfaction of Canadian university librarians, replicating a 1993 American study by Horenstein. Data analysis concentrated on comparisons between faculty and non-faculty-status librarians, and administrative and non-administrative librarians. Although faculty/academic-status librarians were significantly more satisfied with their involvement in university affairs, they were not more satisfied with other dimensions of their work such as workload and salary. Administrative librarians were significantly more satisfied with most of the major aspects of work being measured, and perceived themselves to be much more involved in library planning and university affairs than did non-administrative librarians. Relationships with library users were seen as the single most satisfactory item in both Horenstein's study and the Canadian study.

Oshagbemi (1998) found that the overall job-satisfaction score increased proportionately with age but research satisfaction decreased consistently with age. With the exception of academics under 35 years, the older an academic was, the more satisfaction he or she derived from the teaching aspects of their job.

Currie (1996) interviewed 115 academics in 2 public universities in Western Australia to gain insight into how their lives had been affected by globalisation practices. The majority of respondents (70 percent) said they had more stress in their jobs. More staff aged 45 years and over than those who were younger said they were experiencing stress. Forty-one percent of respondents reported low morale with 18 percent reporting that their morale varied. Forty percent reported reasonable (18 percent) or high morale (22 percent).

McInnis, Powles, and Anwyl (1994) drew on the results of a 1993–94 national study of the social and educational roles and values of Australian academic staff and reported that 63 percent of the sample disagreed and 28 percent gave a neutral response as to whether the 1988 reforms of the Australian tertiary sector had achieved their effectiveness and efficiency goals; 62 percent disagreed and 28 percent were neutral that quality assurance mechanisms will ensure genuine improvement to the higher education system. Forty-four percent believed their professional autonomy to have improved, 39 percent felt it had stayed the same, and 17 percent felt it had deteriorated. Over all 66 percent indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs, and 48 percent were satisfied with their institutions.

The authors conclude:

The key problem for leadership (and perhaps for academics themselves) identified by this study, is that a large majority of academics remain satisfied with their work despite the continuing relative decline in their salaries, their working conditions, and their relationships with university administrators.

> They seem on the whole to be remarkably tolerant in the face of attack. Our results suggest that many, if not most, academics still see their work essentially as a vocation; they are prepared to trade-off material rewards for their autonomy, and the satisfaction that comes from working for the good of society. We suspect, however, that there must be a point at which the trade-off becomes intolerable. There is indication from the study that the gap between the administration and the academics is such that institutional loyalty is becoming less relevant for academics. It needs to be asked, at what point does this gap become dysfunctional for both the academics and the universities (p. 26).

SAMPLE DESIGN

Survey Development

As the main objective of the study was to compare 1998 data with the 1994 baseline study, the questionnaires for each of the 4 AUS occupational groups largely reproduced the 1994 questionnaires with some new questions. In 1998 a number of closed questions were developed using categories coded from open questions in 1994. The draft questionnaires were trialled with 10 academics and 10 general staff members from around the country, and the main survey was administered in April 1998.

As in 1994, each questionnaire contained a selection of questions common to all occupational groups and additional questions specific to the work roles of each occupational group. Information was asked of respondents via a variety of question types: closed questions that required respondents to select from a finite number of options, open questions that required a written response, later coded, and rating scales that required respondents to rate factors. Copies of the questionnaires are provided in Appendix B.

Sampling

A systematic random sample, stratified by university, was selected from AUS mailing lists. In order to obtain a representative sample, different proportions of each occupational group were chosen with larger proportions selected from the smaller groups. The sample covered a third of all academics and technicians, and half of all support staff and library staff from each university. In 1994 separate samples of academic and administrative support staff were obtained and these support staff were treated as 2 separate groups. In 1998 these 2 groups were combined.

Two reminder letters were sent to ensure the highest possible return rate for the survey. Tables showing the original samples and responses are given in Appendix A.

Interpretation of Tables, Statistics, and Terms

Unless otherwise stated, all table percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents from each occupational group. All column percentages do not total 100 percent as, for some questions, it was possible to select more than one category and not all respondents replied to all questions. Rounding of percentages may also affect column totals.

"General staff" refers to a combination of the following occupational groups: academic and administrative support, library, and technical. Tables that report such combined data may slightly overrepresent librarians, academic support, and administrative support staff. This is due to the smaller size of these occupational groups, and the fact that they were sampled in larger numbers to ensure that there would be enough respondents in each category for the purposes of statistical analysis.

"University staff" refers to university staff who were AUS members at the time of the survey.

Because academic and administrative support staff were treated as two separate groups in 1994 and as one group in 1998, results for the two years are only included when both groups were asked the particular question in 1994.

Some tables report only responses given by more than 25 percent (in answer to closed questions). This cut-off point was selected because there are fewer possible answers in a closed-option question as answers are presupplied, and therefore the percentages in each category are usually higher than if the question was asked in open-ended format.

Analysis

All responses to both closed or coded open-ended questions were transferred into SAS data sets, and frequencies and cross-tabulations produced for each occupational group. Cross-tabulations were tested for significance using chi-squares. Only differences at the $p \leq 0.05$ level are included in the results. At this level, a 1 in 20 chance exists that the difference or relationship observed could have arisen by chance. Tests of significance do not imply causal relationships, simply statistical association. Comparisons were made between the responses of different occupational groups, between universities, by gender, and by occupational status. Comparisons were made between the 2 years where the data were comparable.

Response Characteristics

Total questionnaires returned were 1155 (55 percent). This is somewhat lower than the 1994 return rate of 66 percent (1181). By way of comparison, the 1998 United Kingdom study commissioned by the Association of University Teachers (Kinman, 1988) obtained a response rate of 39 percent (782). Return rates for this New Zealand study by occupational group were: 52 percent for support staff, 58 percent for librarians, 61 percent for technicians, and 54 percent for academic staff. Response rates by university were: Lincoln 59 percent, Auckland 46 percent, Otago 55 percent, Massey 61 percent, Canterbury 65 percent, Victoria 55 percent, and Waikato 60 percent (*see* appendix A, tables 35 and 36, for full details).

Sample Representativeness

To gauge whether the survey return was representative of all AUS members, the responses were checked against available information on the distribution of the AUS membership by university and by gender. These comparisons show that the survey responses are generally representative of AUS members, but there is some overrepresentation of female support and technical staff (*see* tables 41 and 42).

RESULTS

1—EMPLOYMENT STATUS, WORK HOURS, AND SALARY

Employment Status

As in 1994 the majority of respondents were employed full time: 91 percent of academics (92 percent in 1994); 92 percent of technicians (91 percent); 88 percent of support staff; (88 percent academic support and 84 percent administrative support); and, somewhat lower than other groups, 71 percent of librarians (84 percent). Academic women were more than twice as likely to be employed part time (13 percent compared with 5 percent), as were female technicians (14 percent compared with 2 percent).

Most staff were still employed on a permanent basis as shown by table 1, but the percentages of academics, librarians, and technicians were lower than in 1994, and for librarians and academics this difference was significant.[1] Academic women were 3 times as likely as academic men to be employed on a limited-term contract (27 percent compared with 8 percent), or on probation for a tenured position (12 percent compared with 4 percent). Thirty percent of part-time librarians were on limited-term contracts, compared with 3 percent of full-time librarians.

Table 1

Type of Contract

Type	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Permanent	87	78	85	95	96	87	93	89
Limited-term	11	15	13	5	2	11	6	9
Other	2	7	1	-	1	2	-	-

Thirty-three percent of permanent/tenured academic staff, 6 percent of support staff, 4 percent of librarians, and 3 percent of technicians responded that they had formerly been employed on limited-term contract as an academic.

Table 2 shows the length of contracts for respondents on a limited-term contract.

[1] It should be noted however that in the 1998 questionnaire academics could select "probation/tenure track" instead of "permanent" or "limited-term". Seven percent selected this option, and these results are reported as "other" for purposes of comparison with 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Length of Limited-term Contract

Length	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=62	1998 N=81	1994 N=25	1998 N=11	1994 N=7	1998 N=16	1994 N=16	1998 N=19
0–5 months	-	9	-	-	1	-	-	-
6–11 months	2	11	1	2	2	10	-	2
1–2 years	17	**25**	13	3	-	4	8	**11**
3–4 years	34	25	8	6	3	2	7	5
More than 4 years	x	11	x	-	x	-	x	1
Other	9	1	3	-	1	5	1	-

x denotes categories not included that year.
Note—the median category for each group is in **bold** type.

General staff and academics were asked how long they had been employed on a contract and how many contracts they had had. Only 6 percent of academics and between 1–3 percent of general staff answered these questions so the results are not reported. The reason for this may have been that respondents were unsure as to whether the term "contract" referred to time periods or negotiated employment contracts.

As in 1994, academic staff tended to have been in university employment for longer than most groups of general staff. Sixty percent of academics (68 percent in 1994), 30 percent of support staff (26 percent), 39 percent of librarians (30 percent) and 52 percent of technicians (46 percent) reported that they had been in university employment for 11 or more years.

Table 3

Total Length of Time in University Employment

Years	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
0–5 years	16	17	42	**44**	49	**30**	23	25
6–10 years	16	23	**32**	25	**22**	**30**	**29**	24
11–20 years	**28**	**28**	18	19	20	25	29	**35**
21–30 years	34	24	7	10	9	11	16	14
More than 30 years	6	8	1	1	1	3	2	3

Note—the median category for each group is in **bold** type.

Part-time academic staff[2] were twice as likely to be relatively new to university employment (37 percent had spent less than 5 years, compared with 15 percent of full-time academics). Thirty-three percent had been in their present job for less than 2 years compared with 16 percent of full-time academics. Only 37 percent of part-time academic staff had permanent jobs, compared with 82

[2] Relevant work characteristics of part-time staff were analysed only for academic and library staff because of the larger number of part-time staff in these occupations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

percent of full-time academics. They were much more likely to be undertaking postgraduate study to advance their career, 33 percent compared with 13 percent of full-time academics. Opportunities for staff development related to teaching were the same for part-time as full-time academics. Part-time staff were just as likely as full-time staff to feel they had been given enough on the job training for their work.

Similar patterns were evident for part-time librarians: 48 percent had spent less than 5 years in university employment compared with 24 percent of full-time librarians. However, 24 percent of part-time librarians had no opportunity for staff development in the last 12 months compared with 5 percent of full-time librarians.

Men had spent longer in university employment than women, and longer in their present position. Men were 3 times as likely as women to have spent more than 20 years in university employment (42 percent compared with 13 percent). They were twice as likely to have been 9 years or more in their current position (46 percent compared with 23 percent of women).

Similar gender patterns were also evident for support staff, but more men than women support staff were employed on limited-term contracts. Male technicians were more likely than female to have spent more than 20 years in university employment (25 percent compared with 7 percent), but just as likely to be new to university work. There were no gender differences related to length of employment in the university sector for librarians, but male librarians were more likely to have been in the same job for longer: 41 percent for 7 or more years, compared with 28 percent of female librarians.

The estimated average length of time in their present position was 5–6 years (5–6 years also in 1994) for most respondents.

Table 4

Length of Time in Present Position

Years	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Less than 1 year	8	6	7	10	19	7	5	4
1–2 years	12	12	24	22	17	22	12	13
3–4 years	15	22	23	27	26	26	23	20
5–6 years	9	12	13	10	15	12	15	11
7–8 years	12	11	16	9	6	8	15	13
9+ years	43	37	17	23	16	23	30	38

Note—the median category for each group is in bold type.

Māori academics responding were more likely to have joined the university in the last 5 years (46 percent compared with 15 percent of Pakeha/European), and to be employed on limited-term contracts (46 percent compared with 14 percent of Pakeha/European). Pakeha/European general staff were less likely than those from other ethnic groups, including Māori, to have been employed in the last 5 years (31 percent compared with 53 percent).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Average Hours[3] Worked Per Week

In 1998, university academics were working the same number of hours (53) on average per week as in 1994. Forty-five percent of professors worked 60 hours or more a week, compared with 20 percent of other academic staff. Full-time general staff were employed for 37.5 hours per week. Actual hours worked were slightly more than this. Full-time support staff worked 41 hours a week on average (44), with 23 percent working more than 45 hours a week; full-time technicians worked 40 hours per week on average in 1994 and 1998, with 17 percent working more than 45 hours a week in 1998, and full-time librarians worked 40 hours a week on average (39), with 15 percent working more than 45 hours a week in 1998.

Table 5

Average Hours Worked Per Week by Full-time Respondents

Hours	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=508 %	1998 N=493 %	1994 N=164 %	1998 N=204 %	1994 N=154 %	1998 N=126 %	1994 N=229 %	1998 N=192 %
Less than 30 hours	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
30-34 hours	2	1	4	2	6	1	3	2
35-39 hours	3	3	30	29	53	52	47	50
40-44 hours	11	9	40	37	27	29	34	31
45-49 hours	20	17	17	15	9	10	13	11
50-54 hours	23	29	5	7	2	2	3	4
55-59 hours	19	13	2	2	-	2	-	-
60-64 hours	13	14	2	1	-	-	-	2
65-69 hours	5	5	0	-	1	1	-	-
More than 69 hours	5	5	1	-	-	-	-	1

Note—the median category for each group is in bold type.

The average number of hours worked by part-time academic staff was 29 hours, with 5 percent working more than 40 hours on an average week. Part-time general staff were employed on average for 21 hours per week. Support staff worked on average 24 hours, librarians 21 hours, and technicians, 21 hours.

Work Outside University Hours

All respondents were asked whether they worked in the evenings or took work home, and whether they worked in the weekends (excluding shift work). Eighty-seven percent of academics (90 percent in 1994), 33 percent of support staff (50 percent of academic support staff and 15 percent of administrative staff), 25 percent of technicians (23 percent) and 23 percent of librarians (20 percent) indicated that they worked in the evenings on 1 evening or more a week. In addition 16 percent of librarians, 26 percent of technicians, 24 percent of support staff, and 9 percent of academics indicated that they took work home 1 or 2 evenings a month. Figures for staff who never took work home were 37 percent of librarians, 19 percent of support staff, 24 percent of

[3] Time has been rounded to the nearest hour.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

technicians, and 1 percent of academics.

Eighty-five percent of academics (84 percent in 1994), 20 percent of support staff (42 percent of academic support staff and 13 percent of administrative support staff), 21 percent of technicians (19 percent), and 15 percent of librarians (13 percent) reported that they worked on 1 or more weekends a month.

Occasional weekend work was reported by 42 percent of support staff (48 percent of academic support staff and 33 percent of administrative support staff), 45 percent of technicians (44 percent), 24 percent of librarians (23 percent), and 14 percent of academics (14 percent). Fifty-eight percent of librarians (63 percent), 35 percent of support staff (10 percent of academic support staff and 49 percent of administrative support staff), 32 percent of technicians (35 percent), and 1 percent of academics (0 percent) reported they never worked on weekends.

In 1998, 15 percent of academics were currently undertaking postgraduate study in order to advance their career. (This question was not asked in 1994.)

Average Full-time Salaries of Staff

The average salary of respondents differed across occupational groups. The average[4] full-time academic salary was $64,340. Full-time support staff earned, on average, $38,140 a year, librarians $37,740, and technicians $35,600.

Table 6

Average Salary of Full-time Respondents

Salary	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=504 %	1998 N=493 %	1994 N=162 %	1998 N=204 %	1994 N=148 %	1998 N=126 %	1994 N=229 %	1998 N=192 %
Less than $20,001	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	-
$20,001–$30,000	-	-	39	21	56	25	30	16
$30,001–$40,000	4	4	26	37	27	34	61	58
$40,001–$50,000	22	12	20	26	9	23	6	23
$50,001–$60,000	10	23	8	8	4	11	-	2
$60,001–$70,000	37	22	3	4	-	2	-	-
More than $70,000	26	37	2	1	-	2	-	-

Note—the median category for each group is in bold type.

Average salaries of male and female full-time workers were compared with assess whether there were any differences by gender within occupational groups. Marked gender differences related to salary were found.

- Full-time female *academics* earned $57,790 a year on average, compared with $69,460 for full-time male academics. Thirty percent of full-time female academics and 9 percent of full-time male academics earned less than $50,000 a year; 7 percent of full-time female academics and 22 percent of full-time male academics earned more than $80,000 a year.

[4] This estimate is based on taking the mid-point of the categories used and multiplying by the number of people in the category.

28 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Full-time female *support staff* earned $36,250 a year on average, compared with $43,830 for full-time male support staff. Twenty-six percent of full-time female support staff and 11 percent of full-time male support staff earned less than $30,000 a year; 6 percent of full-time female support staff and 28 percent of full-time male support staff earned more than $50,000 a year.
- Full-time female *librarians* earned $36,220 a year on average, compared with $45,000 for full-time male librarians. Thirty percent of full-time female librarians and 13 percent of full-time male librarians earned less than $30,000 a year; 10 percent of full-time female librarians and 29 percent of full-time male librarians earned more than $50,000 a year.
- Full-time female *technicians* earned $32,920 a year on average, compared with $37,540 for full-time male technicians. Twenty-two percent of full-time female technicians and 12 percent of full-time male technicians earned less than $30,000 a year; 11 percent of full-time female technicians and 34 percent of full-time male technicians earned more than $40,000 a year.

The gender differences in full-time academic salaries were related to position.[5] While there were comparable proportions of male and female professors, women were more likely to be in less senior positions. Some gender differences in salary remained after taking length of service and position into account. Female lecturers who had 6–10 years of academic work experience were less likely than men to earn more than $50,000, and female senior lecturers who had 11–20 years of academic work experience were less likely to earn more than $70,000.

Employer Contributions to Superannuation

Staff were asked if they received employer contributions to superannuation.[6] Approximately half the general staff and nearly a third of the academic staff received no employer contribution to superannuation.

Table 7

University Staff Receiving Employer Contributions to Superannuation

	Academics	Academic and Admin Support	Librarians	Technicians
No employer contribution	29	46	56	59
Government superannuation fund	46	16	24	20
National Provident fund	0	1	1	1
NZUSS scheme	18	28	12	11

Women academics were less likely to belong to an employer-subsidised superannuation scheme and therefore they were less likely to receive employer contributions to superannuation (41 percent did not receive employer contributions compared with 23 percent of men). A similar pattern was evident for support staff, but not for technicians or librarians. Sixty-five percent of

---

[5] See appendix B, table 43 Gender and academic positions.

[6] For this to be the case staff need to belong to an employer-subsidised superannuation scheme. Any staff member with a contract lasting more than a year is entitled to join the university scheme and the employer is required to subsidise employee contributions.

part-time academic staff received no employer contributions to superannuation compared with 26 percent of full-time staff. Fewer librarians received employer support with superannuation: 44 percent of full-time librarians had no employer contribution, and 86 percent of part-time librarians.

Adequacy of Salary

As shown by table 7, many university staff continued to feel that their salary was not adequate in relation to their work. However, the proportion of librarians who thought their salary was adequate almost doubled from 1994 to 1998.

Table 8

Views of Salary Adequacy in Relation to Work

View	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Adequate	32	26	17	19	16	31	17	18
Inadequate	54	58	73	66	68	58	72	66
Not sure	14	14	10	13	14	11	9	15

There was a marked difference between the academics who earned less than $70,000 a year and those who earned more, with 20 percent of the group earning less judging that their salary reflected the demands of their work, compared with 39 percent of the higher-paid group. Female academics were less likely to judge their salary adequate than male academics (21 percent compared with 30 percent), as were part-time academics (16 percent compared with 27 percent of full-time academics). Professors and assistant professors were twice as likely to think that their salary adequately reflected the demands of their job (40 percent compared with 21 percent of senior lecturers and lecturers).

Support staff who earned less than $50,000 a year were half as likely as those who earned more than this to find it adequately reflected their job (17 percent compared with 37 percent).

Male technicians were less satisfied with their salary than female technicians: 74 percent thought it inadequate compared with 55 percent.

In addition to stating whether they thought their salary adequately reflected the demands of their job, respondents were invited to comment if they wished.

Nineteen percent of academics, 10 percent of support staff, 8 percent of technicians, and 6 percent of librarians commented that their salary was inadequate relative to salaries internationally (academics only), within the private sector, other professions, and/or within their university generally. Twelve percent of academics, 22 percent of support staff, 18 percent of technicians, and 15 percent of librarians commented that their salary did not reflect their workload/number of hours worked.

Smaller numbers commented that their salary level had deteriorated (5 percent of academics, 1 percent of support staff, 4 percent of technicians, and 7 percent of librarians).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

In 1998, most university staff continued to be employed full time and permanently. Between 1994 and 1998 there was a significant decrease in the percentage of academics employed on a permanent basis, from 87 percent in 1994 to 78 percent in 1998. This was also the case for librarians in 1998, 87 percent of whom were employed on a permanent basis compared with 96 percent in 1994.

On average, academics (53 hours) and technicians (40 hours) worked the same number of hours per week in 1998 and in 1994; full-time support staff worked slightly fewer hours (41) in 1998 than in 1994 (44); and librarians worked about the same number of hours in both years (40 in 1998 and 39 in 1994). More librarians were employed part-time than other university occupational groups, and in 1994.

Most academics (87 percent) reported that they worked in the evening or took work home on 1 evening or more a week compared with a third of support staff and a quarter of technicians and library staff. Most academics (85 percent) reported that they worked on 1 or more weekends a month compared with 15–21 percent of the other 3 occupational groups. The percentages of staff in the 4 occupational groups who worked in the evenings and weekends were very similar to 1994.

Academics who earned less than $70,000 and technicians who earned less than $50,000 per year were half as likely as the higher paid staff in their occupational group to feel that their salary was adequate. Over all, between a little over half and two-thirds of respondents in each of the 4 occupational groups felt they were inadequately paid.

There were gender differences in positions held by academic men and women. While there were comparable proportions of male and female professors, women were more likely to be in less senior positions. These differences were related to differences in salaries.

Men had spent longer in university employment than women, and longer in their present position. Men were 3 times as likely as women to have spent more than 20 years in university employment, and twice as likely to have been 9 years or more in their current position. These differences may be related to gender differences in salary.

There were marked salary and length-of-service differences by gender for full-time staff in each of the 4 groups. Female academics earned on average $12,000 a year less than their male colleagues. Female support staff earned $7,000 less, females librarians $11,000 less, and female technicians $5,000 less.

2—RESPONSIBILITIES

Teaching Responsibilities

There has been little change since 1994 in academic teaching responsibilities in terms of the average number of courses taught, the number of direct contact teaching hours, or postgraduate student supervision. Some individual workloads are far greater than the averages. There has been some reduction since 1994 in the proportion of librarians and technicians involved in direct teaching.

Ninety-four percent of academics (98 percent in 1994), 62 percent of technicians (67 percent), 44 percent of librarians (54 percent), and 27 percent of support staff[7] taught or instructed students.

Academic Staff

Full-time academics had overall responsibility for 1 to 8 courses in 1998 (1 to 10 in 1994), with an average of 3 courses each in both years. Respondents taught in anything from 1 to 18 undergraduate courses (1–15 in 1994), the average being 4 courses per year in both 1994 and 1998.

On average, the number of postgraduate tutorials given by full-time academics per year was 20 (18 in 1994), with a range of 1 to 136 (1 to 200 in 1994). They supervised up to 80 postgraduate students (70), the average being 4 students (5), and in term time they spent an average of 9 (10) hours per week on this task.

Full-time academics who taught undergraduate classes reported spending an average of 7 hours per week in both 1998 and 1994 on direct contact teaching, with a range 1–31 hours (1–30).

In addition, 2 respondents reported that they taught 54 and 76 hours respectively.

For postgraduate teaching, the average was 2 hours per week (3 in 1994), with a range of 1–12 hours. (In addition, 3 respondents reported that they taught 14, 21, and 30 hours respectively.) In total, direct contact teaching hours per week were 9 in 1998 (10).

Small percentages of academics (19 percent in 1998, 16 percent in 1994) were involved in staff training or induction courses. In 1998, for full-time staff who were involved, the average number of sessions was 1 (2 in 1994), and the range of sessions was 1 to 30 in both years.

In 1998, 72 percent of the academics had the opportunity in the previous 12 months to take part in staff development focused on teaching, and 49 percent of these respondents took part.

Support Staff

Of the support staff responding to the survey, 17 percent gave presentations or formal instruction to undergraduates and 12 percent to postgraduates. Full-time staff gave an average of 22 undergraduate classes per year; the number of sessions varied from 1 to 60. (In addition 2 staff reported giving 100 sessions per year and one reported giving 259 sessions). Full-time staff gave an average of 4 postgraduate classes per year; the number of sessions given ranged from 1 to 26.

Thirty-one percent of support staff were involved in staff training or induction courses—an

---

[7] The 1998 survey did not differentiate between academic and administrative support staff, as the 1994 survey did. Thus some comparisons are not possible across the years.

average of 9 sessions per year for full-time staff—with the number of sessions ranging from 1 to 40. (In addition 1 person reported having contributed to 140 courses- see footnote 9)

Library Staff

Thirty-nine percent of librarians (52 percent in 1994) reported that they gave presentations or formal instruction to undergraduates, and 27 percent (30 percent) instructed postgraduates. Full-time staff gave an average of 18 (22) undergraduate and 12 (18) postgraduate presentations per year. The number of presentations given by full-time staff varied from 1 to 100 (1–99) for both undergraduates and postgraduates. Forty-six percent (39 percent) of librarians contributed to staff training courses; for full-time staff this meant an average of 4 (5) courses per year, and the number of sessions varied from 1 to 15 in both 1998 and 1994.

Technical Staff

Fewer technical staff in 1998 than in 1994 reported that they gave presentations or formal instruction to undergraduate classes (30 percent in 1998, 53 percent in 1994) and assisted postgraduate students (22 percent in 1998, 55 percent in 1994). Full-time staff gave an average of 13 (8) presentations to undergraduate classes ranging from 1 to 200 presentations (1 to 40), and an average of 4 (18) presentations to postgraduate classes ranging from 1 to 30 (1 to 300).

Eighteen percent of technicians contributed to staff training courses. For full-time staff this meant an average of 4 (2) courses per year. The number of courses technical staff were involved in varied from 1 to 20 (1 to 6).

Student Numbers

Tables 9 and 10 show the minimum and maximum numbers of undergraduates taught in any one course or class by respondents with teaching responsibilities.

Table 9

Minimum Number of Undergraduates Taught or Assisted in Any One Course

	Academic		Academic and Admin support	Library		Technicians	
Number of students	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
1–10	21	20	12	41	30	15	27
11–20	19	18	4	7	5	8	11
21–30	12	15	2	1	1	13	5
31–40	11	12	-	-	-	4	4
41–50	7	5	-	1	-	3	4
51–60	6	5	-	1	-	3	1
61–70	3	3	-	-	-	1	2
71–80	3	2	-	1	-	-	1
81–90	1	1	-	-	-	1	0
91 or more	12	11	-	-	1	6	5
Do not teach	5	6	73	39	56	21	38

Note—the median category for each group is in bold type.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10

Maximum Number of Undergraduates Taught or Assisted in Any One Course

Number of students	Academic		Academic and Admin support	Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
1–20	2	3	5	**29**	**18**	8	14
21–40	6	8	3	7	6	10	**12**
41–60	9	9	3	4	4	6	6
61–80	11	9	2	1	2	4	7
81–100	9	7	1	3	3	7	4
101–200	**26**	**26**	3	2	2	10	9
201–300	14	12	1	2	3	4	1
301–400	7	7	1	1	–	3	2
401–500	3	4	–	–	–	1	1
501 or more	9	7	1	1	1	2	5
Do not teach	5	6	**73**	**39**	**56**	**21**	**38**

Note—the median category for each group is in bold type.

Workload Responsibilities

Respondents were asked what proportion of time they spent on a number of key work areas identified for each occupational group.[8] Estimates of the proportions of time spent on key aspects of work remained much the same in 1994 and 1998 for academics. In 1998, fewer support staff were providing technical services, but more were working in other areas, as were librarians. Librarians spent slightly less of their time on general non-contact library work, and technicians, slightly less on providing technical support for research.

Academic Staff

Academics spent on average:

- 48 percent of their time on teaching (48 percent in 1994),
- 21 percent on research (23 percent),
- 20 percent on internal administration and meetings (21 percent), and
- 12 percent on other areas (8 percent).

Support Staff

Support staff spent on average:

- 48 percent of their time providing professional services, planning, or liaison for students, staff, and others (43 percent in 1994),
- 13 percent providing technical/computer services or development (35 percent);
- 19 percent administration/meetings (14 percent), and
- 21 percent other areas (9 percent).

[8] An estimate of the average time spent on each key area was calculated for each occupational group. Due to rounding these estimates do not all total 100 percent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Library Staff

Library staff spent an average of:

- 38 percent of their time on general non-contact library duties (45 percent in 1994),
- 33 percent on contact with users/customer service (33 percent),
- 14 percent on internal administration and meetings (13 percent), and
- 15 percent on other areas (8 percent).

Technical Staff

Technical staff spent an average of :

- 32 percent of their time providing technical support/assistance teaching (28 percent in 1994),
- 25 percent providing technical support for research (30 percent),
- 25 percent on general technical services (21 percent),
- 10 percent on internal administration and meetings (14 percent), and
- 8 percent on other areas (8 percent).

Fifty-two percent of support staff, 44 percent of library staff, and 75 percent of technicians reported dealing with 1–20 student requests per day. With regard to staff requests, 83 percent of library staff, and 88 percent of technicians reported dealing with 1–20 staff requests per day.

Summary

As in 1994, respondents from all groups (apart from librarians) spent the largest proportion of their time supporting students or staff by either teaching, preparing for teaching, or responding to inquiries or requests. Respondents from all groups also spent between 10 percent (technical staff) and 20 percent (academic staff) of their time on administration—an estimated average across all groups of 16 percent (13 percent in 1994) of staff time.

3—CHANGES AND THEIR IMPACT

As well as seeking data to build up a picture of the current work situation and responsibilities of respondents, questions were asked to assess whether there had been changes to these areas since 1994, and what the impact of these changes was.

Although university staff estimates of the time they put into their work were much the same in 1998 as they had been in 1994, most university staff reported an increase in the demands made of them.

Changes to Total Workload

In 1998 slightly fewer respondents (77 percent) than in 1994 (80 percent) said their workload had increased in recent years, but still most respondents in the 4 occupational groups (71 percent to 84 percent) reported that their workload had increased since 1994. There was a significant difference in the percentage of librarians reporting that their workload was about the same in 1998 (18 percent) and in 1994 (10 percent).

Table 11

Changes to Total Workload in Recent Years (1994)/Since 1994 (1998)

Salary	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Increased	80	82	80	74	76	71	85	84
About the same	13	11	9	9	10	18	11	10
Decreased	1	2	2	3	1	2	1	1
Other	1	2	3	8	3	2	1	3

The proportion of academic staff reporting an increased workload since 1994 was much the same at all 7 universities. General staff at Victoria were less likely than their peers at other universities to report an increased workload. Academic staff at Lincoln, Auckland, and Victoria Universities were more likely to report an increase in their total workload than general staff at the same university.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12

Increases to Total Workload in Recent Years (1994)/Since 1994 (1998) by University

University	Academic staff		General staff	
	1994 N=551 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=628 %	1998 N=617 %
Auckland	84	87	84	74
Waikato	80	81	79	78
Massey	70	80	75	77
Victoria	83	83	84	61
Canterbury	79	77	74	79
Lincoln	92	88	83	74
Otago	80	78	85	83

Changes to Workload Areas

As in 1994, respondents were given a list of work areas previously identified as common to members of their occupational group, and asked to state whether their workload in each work area had changed by selecting from the following list of categories: "Increased", "Stayed about the same", "Decreased", "Not sure", and "Not part of workload". Administration and meetings, and support or services to students, were the areas in which increases were most noticeable over all in both years. Table 13 shows that other patterns of workload change remained much the same in 1998 as in 1994. The exceptions were:

- a decrease in the proportion of general staff reporting an increase in professional development, and somewhat fewer academics reporting a decrease in professional development in 1998;
- fewer academics reporting an increase in course or lecture planning in 1998;
- more support staff but fewer technicians reporting an increase in administration and meetings in 1998.

Table 13

Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases and Decreases to Workload in Recent Years (1994 Survey)/Since 1994 (1998 Survey)

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
Common general work areas	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Administration/meetings	+57	+60	+36	+49	+42	+45	+51	+36
Professional development	-21	-11	+20	+14	+37	+25	+29	+13
Student contact/teaching								
Support/services to students	+62	+56	+44	+39	+53	+52	*	*
Course/lecture planning	+61	+44	*	*	*	*	*	*
Postgraduate supervision	+44	+40	*	*	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	+38	+35	*	*	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	+30	+28	*	*	*	*	*	*
Student marking/evaluation	x	+47	x	*	x	*	x	*
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	*	*	+41	+47
Instruction/induction	*	*	+20	+20	+23	+29	*	*
Research								
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	*	*	+35	+29
Research/writing/publishing	-8	+3	*	*	*	*	+10	+11
Peer review of research proposals	x	+26	x	*	x	*	x	*
Non-common general work areas								
Support/services to staff	*	*	+58	+53	+40	+39	*	*
Support/services to external clients	*	*	+33	+34	+25	+28	*	*
Word-processing	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Technical or computer services	*	*	*	+28	*	*	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	*	+50	+48	*	*
General technical services	*	*	*	*	*	*	+39	+31
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	*	*	+40	+39
Mentoring other staff	x	+36	x	*	x		x	*
Consultation/professional services	+14	+16	*	*	*	*	+33	+34
Other areas	+9	+8	+31	+39	+20	+29	+23	+30

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.
+ indicates a higher percentage selecting "Increased".
- indicates a higher percentage selecting "Decreased".
Tables reporting the actual percentages of those selecting the categories "Increased", "Decreased", and "Staying about the same" are included in appendix A (tables 44a-c).

The 3 work areas where each group had the highest percentages of respondents reporting workload increases were:

For academics:

- administration/meetings,
- support/services to students,
- course/lecture planning, (and student marking/evaluation—not asked in 1994).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For support staff:

- support/services to staff,
- administration/meetings, and
- support/services to students.

For library staff:

- support/services to students,
- non-contact library duties, and
- administration/meetings.

For technicians:

- technical support for teachers,
- equipment maintenance, and
- administration/meetings.

Expected Changes to Workload in the Future

As in 1994, an average of 55 percent of respondents across the groups in 1998 thought it was likely that their workload would increase in the future. In 1994 academics were least likely to anticipate an increased workload; in 1998 their view was much the same as that of general staff. Approximately a fifth of the librarians and technicians have become optimistic that their workload will decrease.

Table 14

Expected Workload Levels in Future (1994 Survey)/in Next 3 Years (1998 survey)

Expected change	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Increase	47	52	71	57	62	56	56	56
No change	36	31	10	17	17	1	16	1
Decrease	6	3	2	1	2	21	2	23
Not sure	12	13	14	20	20	20	27	18

Changes to the Number of Requests for Services

Seventy-three percent of support staff, 83 percent of librarians (80 percent 1994), and 73 percent (39 percent) of technicians dealt with requests from students daily. In 1998, 32 academics (6 percent) reported that they did not teach.[9]

[9] This may have been because of additional management and/or research responsibilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The numbers dealing with staff requests daily were 96 percent of support staff, 97 percent of technicians, and 93 percent of librarians. Daily requests for consultation/information/ professional services from clients outside the university were dealt with by 69 percent of staff support, 66 percent of technicians, and 58 percent of librarians.

Respondents who serviced requests were asked if they had noticed any changes to the volume of requests they received from these 3 groups.

Support Staff

Of the support staff who serviced student requests, 50 percent had noticed an increase since 1994. Of those who serviced staff requests, 64 percent had noticed an increase, as had 43 percent of those who serviced outside clients.

Library Staff

Of the library staff who serviced student requests, 63 percent (84 percent) had noticed an increase in requests. Of those servicing staff requests, 58 percent (68 percent) had noticed an increase, as had 33 percent (51 percent) of those servicing outside clients.

Technical Staff

Of the technical staff who provided general technical services, 64 percent reported that they had experienced an increase in the number of staff requests, 60 percent in the number of student requests, and 33 percent in the number of requests from outside clients. In 1994, 82 percent reported increases over all in the number of requests for their services.

Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed

The majority of survey respondents who instructed or taught students had experienced an increase in student numbers. However, the proportion of academics noting a decrease doubled from 6 percent to 12 percent between 1994 and 1998.[10]

[10] This may reflect the higher number of academics perhaps not engaged in teaching due to increased management responsibilities.

Table 15

Changes to the Number of Students Taught or Instructed from 1989 Onwards (1994 Survey)/from 1994 Onwards (1998 Survey)

Change	Academic		Academic and Admin support	Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=505 %	1998 N=538 %	1998 N=216 %	1994 N=82 %	1998 N=161 %	1994 N=179 %	1998 N=209 %
Increased—large amount	41	25	16	34	20	45	26
Increased—small amount	30	29	12	27	18	31	29
Stayed about the same	18	22	5	22	7	13	7
Decreased—small amount	4	8	1	-	2	-	6
Decreased—large amount	2	4	1	4	1	3	0
Varies from year to year	5	5	1	4	3	7	9
Not sure	1	2	6	10	4	2	4

Changes to Work Situation

Respondents were asked whether they had noticed any changes in recent years to a range of elements within their work situation. Table 16 shows the net percentage difference between those reporting an improvement compared with those reporting deterioration. The main areas where deterioration is reported are funding, career prospects and, for academics, ability to exercise academic freedom, ability to take research leave, and working life in general.

The main areas where improvement is reported are resources, work environment (space/light), interactions with colleagues, students, and outside clients and IT support.

There are some significant changes between 1994 and 1998:

- an increase in the proportion in all groups registering a deterioration in the overall management of their university.
- an increase in the academics who registered a deterioration in the funding method for teaching.
- a small increase in academics registering an improvement in their interactions with colleagues, other university staff, students, and outside clients, and in their work environment.
- a small decrease in academics registering a deterioration in the administration of their own area.
- a very large increase in the general staff who register a deterioration in the level of funding for their work, and large increases registering deterioration in the method of funding for their work.
- an increase in the proportion of technicians registering a deterioration in their career prospects.
- a small decrease in the library staff registering an improvement in their work environment.

Table 16

Net Difference Between the Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement and Deterioration in Their Work Situation in Last 4 Years

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
Quality of	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Resources/equipment	+27	+21	+45	+51	+60	+53	+30	+24
Instruction/teaching	+24	x	*	x	+39	x	*	x
Student evaluations of teaching	+20	+18	*	*	*	*	*	*
Performance reviews/appraisals	+9	+12	+1	+1	+25	0	+5	+1
Admin/organisation in area	+7	-3	+12	+17	+19	0	+3	+7
Interactions with outside clients	+4	+12	+17	+24	+9	+16	+16	+34
Work environment (space/light)	+3	+9	+10	+24	+30	+21	-6	+10
Interactions with students	+2	+9	+18	+25	+31	+28	+13	+23
Interactions with other uni. staff	-12	-4	+23	+27	+28	+30	+17	+17
Interactions with colleagues	-17	-6	+24	+25	+24	+25	+21	+14
Overall university management	-35	-46	-23	-33	-8	-28	-27	-34
Working life in general	-46	-42	-18	x	-1	x	-15	x
IT support	x	+20	x	+28	x	+24	x	+17
Secretarial/admin support	x	-9	x	*	x	*	x	*
University library	x	-2	x	*	x	*	x	*
Other areas								
Level of funding for area	*	*	-9	-39	+3	-46	-28	-50
Method of funding for area	*	*	-10	-24	-9	-23	-15	-31
Method of funding for teaching	-12	-36	*	*	*	*	*	*
Career/promotion prospects	-17	-22	-11	-10	-5	-9	-12	-23
Level of funding for research	-22	x	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ability to exercise academic freedom	-23	-27	*	*	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	-27	x	*	*	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for research	-29	-26	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	-31	-27	*	*	*	*	*	*

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.
+ indicates a higher percentage reporting improvement.
- indicates a higher percentage reporting deterioration.

Reasons for Changes to Work Situation

Respondents listed a variety of reasons for changes to their work situation. For academics the most common reason given for changes to their work situation in 1998 was new or increased job responsibilities and in 1994 it was increases in student numbers. For support staff, librarians, and technicians the most common reason given for changes to their work situation in 1998 and 1994 was new or increased job responsibilities. Increased student numbers were less prominent as a reason for increases to workload in 1998 than in 1994 for academics, support staff, and librarians.

For all university staff, the main reasons for changes to the work situation were related to increased administrative work, including devolution of administration; changes to funding, including reduced staffing levels; restructuring; and a more diverse student population.

Table 17 presents an analysis of the areas mentioned by more than 10 percent of the respondents from each occupational group.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 17

Reasons for Work Situation Changes

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
Most often selected reasons	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Increases in student numbers	61	45	57	38	65	43	56	51
New or increased job responsibilities	58	62	64	63	67	57	64	69
Changes to university management	39	34	29	32	25	p	25	p
Changes to reporting/outputs	37	39	p	33	p	p	p	p
Organisational changes in area/dept	32	35	38	39	26	31	43	35
Requirements of new legislation	29	p	p	p	9	4	37	p
Changes to area/dept funding	26	33	p	31	p	p	32	35
Working with different colleagues	p	p	p	28	27	p	p	26
Change in job position	p	28	p	26	29	30	p	33
Mentoring other staff	x	p	x	p	x	p	x	p
Devolution of administration	x	28	x	p	x	7	x	p
Changing research funding environment	x	27	x	3	x	1	x	p
Student population more diverse	x	31	x	p	x	26	x	p
More individual student tuition	x	p	x	5	x	p	x	p
University restructuring	x	39	x	34	x	p	x	p
Reduction in academic staff levels	x	26	x	4	x	2	x	6
Reduction in general staff levels	x	p	x	28	x	28	x	38
More student counselling	x	p	x	p	x	1	x	3
Semesterisation	x	37	x	29	x	p	x	p
Working as head of department	x	p	x	5	x	6	x	1
Least often selected reasons								
New or changed equipment	p	8	35	p	56	33	34	39
New or changed buildings/work space	p	7	27	p	45	p	35	p
Employment Contracts Act	10	4	p	3	p	3	p	7
Decreases in workload	2	x	1	x	1	x	1	x
Decreases in job responsibilities	2	1	2	3	3	3	1	3
Decreases in student numbers	2	3	0	2	1	-	1	-
Increases in quality of students' work	x	5	x	4	x	p	x	p
Decreases in quality of students' work	x	1	x	2	x	3	x	4

p denotes factors that were selected by less than 25 percent, for the least often selected reasons, or more than 10 percent for the most often selected reasons, of an occupational group.
x denotes categories not included that year.

An open-ended question asked comments on the major impacts, if any, of the changes to university structure and management since 1994 on university staff's work.

Approximately 30 percent of general staff and 40 percent of academic staff provided comments. A representative sample can be found in appendix C.

The main themes were:

- increased job responsibilities,
- lack of confidence in university management,
- increase in administration and reporting,
- negative impact from increased commercialism of university work,
- reduction in staff morale,
- difficulty in communicating with management, and

- increases in student demands.

Balance in Workload

When asked how they viewed the balance of time spent on work areas in their workload, 74 percent (79 percent in 1994) of academics indicated that they would prefer more research time, as did 32 percent of technical staff (30 percent). Nineteen percent of support staff, and 16 percent of technical staff (25 percent), would prefer to spend more time on providing services; 21 percent of library staff (25 percent) would prefer more user contact time. Twenty-two percent of academics indicated that they would prefer less (25 percent), and 7 percent more (10 percent), teaching time.

Seven percent of technical staff (2 percent) and 6 percent (4 percent) of the support staff indicated that they would prefer less time on providing services, and no technicians (2 percent) and no academics stated the same for research (0 percent in 1994 too). A full breakdown of these figures is provided in appendix A (table 46).

Academic views on the balance of tasks in their workload did not differ by position: professors were just as likely as lecturers to prefer more research time, and less time devoted to administration. Only 16 percent of professors and 32 percent of associate professors taught for more than 50 percent of their time, compared with 53 percent of senior lecturers and lecturers, 66 percent of assistant lecturers, and 76 percent of senior tutors and tutors. Seventy-four percent of professors spent more than 20 percent of their time on administration, as did 53 percent of associate professors, and 31 percent of senior lecturers and lecturers.

Table 18 provides the preferences of the different groups on the amount of time currently spent on administration.

Table 18
Balance in Workload

Preference for use of time	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Content with present work balance	12	15	30	31	52	46	32	38
Less administration	44	44	14	10	5	7	21	21
More administration	2	4	27	18	8	9	7	6

Over all, academics were least content with the time given to different aspects of their work, particularly administration and research.

Training

Respondents were asked if they felt they had been given enough training in the following work areas: the everyday requirements of their job, new responsibilities, new technology and equipment, new administration and procedures, e-mail/Internet use, health and safety (e.g., OOS), changes in research funding, and university restructuring.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As in 1994, the majority of respondents indicated that they had received enough training on the everyday requirements of their job, but in 1998 and 1994 the majority reported that they had not received enough training in all other areas (with the exception of e-mail/Internet use, and health and safety (e.g., OOS). As was the case in 1994, university restructuring was the area where the most respondents felt they had not received adequate training. This suggests that such funding information is still not reaching academic and general staff.

Table 19 displays the net percentage differences between those who considered that their training was adequate compared with those who did not. Tables reporting the actual percentages for adequate training are located in appendix A, table 47.

Table 19

Net Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training

Training area	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Everyday requirements of job	+33	+41	+36	+49	+50	+71	+43	+50
New job responsibilities	+3	+2	+1	+6	+20	+28	+4	+9
New technology/computers/equipment	-6	+2	+6	+9	+3	0	-24	+11
New admin/procedure requirements	-22	-15	-9	+1	+16	+11	-5	-8
Email/Internet use	x	+28	x	+28	x	+57	x	+15
Health and safety e.g. OOS	x	+11	x	+26	x	+25	x	+65
Changes in research funding	x	-1	x	-6	x	-10	x	-2
University restructuring	-29	-29	+21	-30	-5	-15	-29	-25

x denotes categories not included that year.

Respondents were asked about the impacts of any changes to their workload and student numbers, and how these factors had influenced their work situation.

Impact of Increased Requests for Service on Workload

The majority of general staff who had experienced increased requests for services since 1994 reported that these changes had increased their workload.

Table 20

Impact on Workload of Increase in Requests

Impact for those reporting increases	Academic and Admin support	Library		Technicians	
	1998 N=164 %	1994 N=145 %	1998 N=126 %	1994 N=95 %	1998 N=152 %
Increased workload	82	87	83	92	87
No impact	8	8	8	4	6
Decreased workload	-	1	-	-	-
Not sure	4	4	9	4	4

Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed

Of the respondents who taught or instructed students, 87 percent in both 1998 and 1994 stated that increasing student numbers had increased their workload.

Table 21

Impact of Increasing Numbers of Students Taught or Instructed

	Academic		Academic and Admin support	Library		Technicians	
Impact for those reporting increases	1994 N=378 %	1998 N=287 %	1998 N=62 %	1994 N=63 %	1998 N=67 %	1994 N=148 %	1998 N=115 %
Increased workload	90	88	86	70	88	92	88
No impact	6	7	8	17	9	5	5
Decreased workload	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Not sure	2	3	3	13	3	3	6

Impact on Personal, Family, and Work Life

Respondents were asked to indicate whether changes to their work situation had had any effect on the quality of 6 aspects of their lives. More negative effects were reported than positive. Academics were the occupational group with the largest percentages of respondents (between 57 percent and 35 percent) reporting detrimental effects on the quality of their lives in 5 of 6 areas. Compared with 1994, significant more academics in 1998 reported a decrease in the quality of their physical health, and significantly more librarians reported a decrease in the quality of their family life or relationships.

Table 22

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Detrimental Effects on 6 Aspects of their Lives

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
Effects on:	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Quality of teaching/instruction	+	23	+	5	+	5	+	10
Quality of research work	+	35	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of services provided	*	*	+	19	+	20	+	24
Quality of physical health	32	41	30	31	29	35	26	29
Quality of emotional health	45	51	38	45	36	37	39	40
Quality of family life/ relationships	36	36	25	19	16	23	23	26
Quality of your leisure activities	61	57	36	31	24	34	32	34

+denotes categories not included that year.

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Between 36 percent and 25 percent of general staff reported improvements to the quality of the services they provided, and some academics reported improved effects on the quality of their research work (16 percent) and teaching/instruction (12 percent). Very small percentages of general staff or academics (between 10 percent and 2 percent) reported any improved effects on the quality of their physical health, emotional health, family life/relationships, or their leisure activities. There were no significant differences in the results regarding improved effects between 1994 and 1998.

Table 23

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improved Effects on 6 Aspects of their Lives

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
Effects on:	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Quality of teaching/instruction	+	12	+	7	+	22	+	15
Quality of research work	+	16	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quality of services provided	*	*	+	26	+	36	+	25
Quality of physical health	3	2	4	3	8	7	3	5
Quality of emotional health	5	5	6	6	15	10	7	7
Quality of family life/ relationships	5	4	5	6	8	7	4	6
Quality of your leisure activities	4	4	5	7	7	7	6	7

+ denotes categories not included that year.

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Summary

University staff continue to feel an increase in the demands of their work. The main areas of increased demands have also stayed much the same since 1994: administration, course and lecture planning for academics, non-contact library duties for librarians; and technical support for teaching and equipment maintenance for technicians. Some of these increased demands are likely to reflect the growing use of information technology (IT) in library work and teaching presentations. Others reflect the increased administrative workload which comes with devolution and restructuring, the changes to funding which focus on maintaining or increasing student numbers for every university department, and in some areas, reduced staff numbers.

Most university staff are unhappy with the balance of their current workload. Most would prefer less administrative work. Twenty-two percent of academic staff would like to have more time for research, and spend less on teaching. Academics and technicians would like to spend more time on research; support staff and librarians on more direct work providing services to users.

There have been some improvements since 1994 in training for university staff in the areas of everyday job requirements and IT. However, university staff still considered they had not received adequate training in changes in research funding and university restructuring.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student numbers and demands do not appear to have grown greatly since 1994. This may reflect university staff becoming accustomed to servicing a higher numbers of students. Some improvements in the quality of university staff's working life are noted: resources; work environment; interactions with colleagues, students, and outside clients; and IT support. Most of these areas show an increase since the 1994 survey in academics noting improvements. However, university staff remain concerned about funding, career prospects, the ability to exercise academic freedom, and take research leave, and working life in general. Compared with the 1994 survey results, there is a notable increase in the proportion of university staff registering a deterioration in the overall management of their university, and in the funding for their work.

The impact of changes to universities continues to have more negative than positive effects for university staff. The changes have had costs for university staff's health and the quality of their personal lives. More university staff report a work-related illness or injury in 1998 than in 1994. These costs do not appear to have made a substantial improvement to the quality of university staff's work, with the possible exception of librarians, where those who consider the quality of their service to have improved outweighs those who think it has deteriorated. There are similar numbers of technicians and support staff who believe the quality has either deteriorated or improved. Twice as many academics believe the quality of their teaching and research has deteriorated compared with those who believe it has improved.

4—STRESSES AND PRESSURES

As in 1994, in order to develop a clearer picture of the levels of work stress and the pressure points in the university environment, respondents were asked a variety of questions about their level of job stress and the factors that contributed to any job stress they felt.

Current Stress Levels

In total, 38 percent (40 percent in 1994) of all respondents found their job often or almost always stressful. The figures were 48 percent in both years for academics, 34 percent (40 percent) for support staff, 34 percent (32 percent) for technicians, and 35 percent for librarians, a significant increase over the 26 percent in 1994.

As in 1994, academics reported significantly more job stress than the other groups.

Table 24

Current Work Stress

Stress level	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Almost never stressful	3	3	6	10	8	8	13	5
Sometimes stressful	49	48	55	55	65	56	56	61
Often stressful	39	37	26	24	22	31	26	27
Almost always stressful	9	11	14	10	4	4	6	7

Both the current stress levels and recent changes to stress levels of academic staff and general staff at each university were compared with see whether there were differences between individual universities in 1998. Academics[11] at one university, Canterbury University, showed less stress than others in 1994, and that continued in 1998. There were no gender differences related to general job satisfaction or stress amongst academics, support staff, or librarians. Some small differences were found but they were not higher than differences due to chance and sample size.

Recent Changes to Stress Levels

To gauge whether the continuing changes at the universities had affected staff stress levels, respondents were asked whether they felt their job had become more or less stressful in recent years. The majority (72 percent, 70 percent in 1994) of respondents stated that their jobs had become much more or more stressful. Again, as in 1994, academics were significantly more likely to say that their stress levels had increased recently compared with the other groups. Table 25

[11] The number of support staff, librarians, and technicians was too small at each university to allow meaningful comparisons by university.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

shows changes to stress levels reported by occupational group.

Table 25

Changes to Stress Levels in Recent Years

Stress level	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Much more or more stressful	80	79	68	68	65	68	69	72
About the same	14	15	17	22	18	24	26	22
Less or much less stressful	3	2	5	4	8	3	3	3
New to job	3	2	6	4	6	4	3	-

Expected Changes to Stress Levels in the Future

Respondents were asked if they expected their job to become more or less stressful in the future. Table 26 reports respondents' views on this question. Over all, 58 percent (49 percent in 1994) thought that their job was likely to become much more or more stressful, and 36 percent (41 percent) thought that their job stress would stay about the same.

Table 26

Expected Stress Levels in Future

Expected future stress level	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Much more or more stressful	54	59	53	52	45	61	46	52
About the same	37	34	35	36	44	33	48	43
Less or much less stressful	8	5	8	7	7	4	3	4

Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses

Over all, 42 percent of respondents (up from 29 percent in 1994) stated that they had suffered from a work-related injury or a stress-related illness while employed in a New Zealand university. This increase was significant for all groups, namely, academics, library staff, technicians, and support staff.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 27

Respondents Experiencing Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses while in University Employment

Experience of illness or injury	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Work-related illness or injury	26	38	30	42	30	45	32	45
No work-related illness or injury	63	56	59	52	61	51	61	51
Not sure	10	4	10	3	7	3	4	4

Respondents who had experienced a work-related injury or stress illness were asked to select the category which described their situation. This was an open question in 1994 and a closed question in 1998.

Table 28

Work-related Injuries or Stress Illnesses

Illness or injury	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=164 %	1998 N=200 %	1994 N=64 %	1998 N=96 %	1994 N=63 %	1998 N=80 %	1994 N=83 %	1998 N=93 %
Back pains	#	12	#	34	#	29	#	35
General stress effects (e.g. insomnia)	35	58	31	60	14	44	16	46
RSI/OOS	27	42	39	45	62	60	33	34
Serious illness	16	2	6	3	2	-	7	5
Psychological illness	16	10	11	10	5	8	7	7
General illness/feeling run down	13	47	22	50	16	34	7	55
Work-related accidents	13	8	11	16	22	9	51	25
Health professional noted stress effects	2	x	3	x	-	x	4	x
Reaction to traumatic event at work	x	12	x	10	x	8	x	8
Other	4	3	2	-	-	-	1	-

x denotes categories not included that year.

In 1994 "back pains" were included with "RSI/OOS".

Women academics were more likely to note these impacts on their health: general illness, feeling run down (28 percent compared with 12 percent of male academics, OOS (21 percent compared with 13 percent), and general stress effects (28 percent compared with 19 percent).

Female librarians reported more OOS than male librarians (31 percent compared with 13 percent).

Māori academics had a higher rate of work-related injury or stress than Pakeha/European: 69 percent compared with 38 percent of Pakeha/European academics.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Stress Ratings

As in 1994, respondents were asked to rate a series of work-related factors on a 6-point scale in terms of whether the factors were a source of stress or pressure, using the key below:

0—Not applicable
1—Never a source of stress or pressure
2—Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3—Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4—Often a source of stress or pressure
5—Always a source of stress or pressure

Factors that were rated as always or often stressful by 25 percent or more by members of each occupational group are included in table 29. The 3 areas which received the highest percentage ratings as sources of stress are highlighted for each group.

As in 1994, general staff rated work-related factors, such as interruptions to work, overall level of workload, and deadlines/demands more highly as sources of stress than the actual content of their work, such as customer service or providing support for staff. No work-content factors were rated as always or often stressful by 25 percent or more of general staff. Factors such as university management and university climate (for support staff in particular), staffing levels for area and lack of recognition for work (librarians), and lack of promotion/career prospects (all general staff groups) also contribute to stress.

Administrative staff were more likely than others to rate clarity of work role and quality of work space as a frequent source of stress, library staff more likely than others to rate equipment and level of funding, and academic staff, the level and method of research funding.

It appears that most stress or pressure in the university environment for general staff continues to be caused by the volume of work and by resourcing and systems issues rather than the actual work content.

For academics there were 4 work-content areas which were rated as often or always stressful by more than 25 percent of respondents. These were lack of time for reading/research (61 percent), marking students' work (37 percent), research writing and publishing (37 percent) and internal administration/meetings (29 percent).

More than 40 percent of academics rated 5 work-related factors as often or always stressful. These were university climate/morale (46 percent), deadlines/demands (44 percent), university management (42 percent), interruptions to work (42 percent) and continual change (41 percent). It appears that for academic staff both work-content issues, and work-related factors such as organisational systems and environment cause stress.

The overall number of students and other aspects of work that involve teaching or servicing undergraduate students tended to be rated as stressful across all occupational groups, but relationships with students were not.

Table 29

Factors Rated as "Always" or "Often" Stressful by 25 Percent or More of Respondents

	Academic		Academic and Admin Support		Librarians		Technicians	
Work-related factors	1994 %	1998 %	1994 %	1998 %	1994 %	1998 %	1994 %	1998 %
Overall level of workload	55	p	44	33	40	**36**	36	**32**
Deadlines/demands	50	**44**	49	29	28	29	40	**31**
Interruptions to work	48	42	51	**40**	39	**34**	42	**36**
Staffing levels for area	35	35	35	29	40	**38**	p	27
University climate/morale	34	**46**	32	**41**	28	29	27	**31**
University redundancies	x	26	x	30	x	p	x	p
Support staff time available	34	31	30	p	37	29	p	p
Level of research funding	34	32	*	*	*	*	*	*
Method of research funding	33	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
Lack of recognition for work	32	35	35	31	33	**34**	29	30
Semesterisation	x	p	x	p	x	26	x	p
Relief staff time	29	p	37	p	43	25	28	p
University management	28	42	26	**35**	p	p	29	25
Irregularity of workload	25	25	26	p	27	p	26	p
Lack of promotion/career prospects	p	p	31	29	36	27	32	31
Lack of feedback about work	p	p	p	26	p	p	p	p
Equipment	p	p	p	p	28	27	25	p
Level of funding for area	*	*	p	p	30	29	p	26
Continual change	x	41	x	25	x	30	x	p
IT support available	x	p	x	p	x	36	x	p
Work content factors								
Marking students' work	41	37	*	*	*	*	*	*
Research/writing/publishing	35	37	*	*	*	*	*	*
Internal administration/meetings	33	29	p	p	p	p	p	p
Lack of time for reading/research	x	61	*	*	x	*	x	*

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
p denotes factors that were rated as stressful by less than 25 percent of this occupational group.
x denotes categories not included that year.
Note—the median category for each group is in bold type.

In terms of source of stress, Canterbury University staff were least affected by university management, university climate or morale, continual change, devolution, redundancies, and, with Victoria University staff, semesterisation.

Canterbury staff's suggestions for change also put less emphasis than staff at other universities on changing university management or having more job security and a better promotion system. They were less likely to mention staff morale as an issue of university-wide concern.

Female academic staff were more likely than male academic staff to mention lack of job security, university redundancies, availability of relieving staff for their job, and IT support or access as often or always sources of stress in their work. Male academic staff were more likely than female academic staff to suggest that improving university management would make their job more worthwhile.

Female general staff were more likely than male general staff to mention university redundancies, the availability of support staff, and IT support available to them as often or always sources of stress in their work.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Stress Profile

Respondents who found their work often or almost always stressful were compared with those who found their work only sometimes or almost never stressful to see if they differed in their responses to other questions.

Academics who found their work often or always stressful were more likely than those who found it sometimes or never stressful to:

- work more than 50 hours a week,
- work in the evenings,
- work in the weekends,
- prefer more research time, and less administration,
- be dissatisfied with their job, and
- feel their salary does not adequately reflect their job.

General staff who found their work often or always stressful were more likely than those who found it sometimes or never stressful to:

- work more than 40 hours a week,
- work in the evenings,
- work in the weekends,
- be dissatisfied with their job, and
- feel their salary does not adequately reflect their job.

Male technicians were more likely to describe their job as often stressful (33 percent compared with 19 percent). Seventeen percent of male technicians described themselves as very satisfied with their job compared with 4 percent of female technicians; their levels of dissatisfaction were similar.

Full-time librarians were 3 times as likely as part-time librarians to report they often felt stressed (38 percent compared with 12 percent), or almost always felt stressed (6 percent compared with 2 percent). Job satisfaction was similar for both groups, as was satisfaction that their salary was adequate for their job.

Full-time academic staff were more likely to say they were very satisfied with their job than part-time academic staff (14 percent compared with 2 percent). Satisfaction and stress levels amongst academics were not linked to the seniority of their position over all.

Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Stress

Stress levels were related to job satisfaction. Seventy-seven percent of those academics who found their job almost never or only sometimes stressful were very satisfied or satisfied with their job, compared with 47 percent of those who were often stressed, and 30 percent of those who were almost always stressed. Eighty-four percent of those who reported that their job had become less stressful in recent years were satisfied with their job, compared with 39 percent of those whose job stress had remained unchanged, and 16 percent of those whose job had become more stressful. Experiences of stress were also reflected in satisfaction with salary. Thirty-nine percent of those whose job stress had decreased or remained unchanged were satisfied that their salary reflected the

demands of their job, compared with 23 percent of those whose job stress had increased. Similar patterns were evident for general staff.

Job Satisfaction

Despite the workload and stress levels reported above, the majority of respondents (62 percent, 65 percent in 1994) indicated that they were very satisfied or satisfied with their jobs. As in 1994, there were no differences between occupational groups in the levels of job satisfaction reported.

Table 30

Current Levels of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=536 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=225 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=177 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=207 %
Very satisfied	14	14	11	17	15	13	17	11
Satisfied	51	46	49	46	54	53	49	48
Neutral	14	15	22	13	13	12	17	22
Dissatisfied	17	18	13	15	14	15	13	14
Very dissatisfied	2	6	3	4	3	4	3	3

In interpreting the seeming disparity between increasing stress and job satisfaction, a variety of factors need to be taken into account. The main sources of work-related stress for many university staff were linked to the organisation of their work and workload, rather than the actual content of their job. For some people an increase in stress can also equate to an increase in challenge and therefore, more job satisfaction.

When asked if their levels of job satisfaction had changed, 35 percent over all (34 percent in 1994) stated their job had become less satisfying, 28 percent (30 percent) more satisfying, and 30 percent (27 percent) about the same. As in 1994, academics were more likely to report that their level of job satisfaction had decreased. In 1994 librarians were more likely to say that their level of job satisfaction had increased. This difference between librarians and other groups had disappeared in 1998.

Table 31

Changes to Levels of Job Satisfaction in Recent Years

Recent change to job satisfaction	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=528 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=228 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=209 %
Much more or more satisfied	24	21	27	28	41	34	31	29
About the same	26	28	32	29	21	31	31	33
Less or much less satisfied	44	46	33	36	25	27	33	34
New to job	3	2	6	4	8	4	2	2
Not sure	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As an indicator of whether they were content in their work and their general job prospects, respondents were asked whether they thought they would be in university employment in 5 years' time. As in 1994, academics were more likely than the other occupational groups to think that they would be. However, fewer academics held this view in 1998 compared with 1994, as did fewer librarians.

Table 32

Likelihood of Being in University Employment in 5 Years' Time

Likelihood of staying in university	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Likely to be in university employment	59	48	36	30	39	30	32	34
Not likely to be in university employment	15	15	24	27	23	28	21	20
Not sure	27	35	42	41	35	41	46	45

Academic women were much less positive that they would remain in university employment in 5 years' time (38 percent thought they would, compared with 54 percent of men). Those on the lower rungs of the academic ladder—assistant lecturers, senior tutors, and tutors—were also less optimistic about continuing university employment (24 percent compared with 51 percent of lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors).

Female support and technician staff were just as likely as male staff to think they would be in university employment in 5 years' time although more female technicians were unsure whether they would remain than male (55 percent compared with 39 percent).

Part-time academics were also less sure that they would stay employed: 28 percent thought they would, compared with 49 percent of full-time academics. But part-time librarians were as confident as full-time librarians, with both showing lower levels of confidence than academics.

Ten percent of academics, 11 percent of librarians, 6 percent of support staff, and 5 percent of technicians responding indicated they would be retiring within the next 5 years.

Fifty-seven percent of those who thought they would not be in university employment in 5 years' time thought they would be retired by then.

General staff aged less than 30 were least likely to indicate they would be in university employment in 5 years' time—13 percent.

Summary

Around 40 percent of university staff found their job often or almost always stressful in 1998; there was no change from 1994. More librarians reported this level of stress than in 1994. Academic stress levels remain highest of all university staff.

Causes of stress are mainly related to volume of work, inadequate time to do justice to work, university restructuring, and low morale related to the restructuring stemming from the major changes to university funding in recent years. The actual content of their university work remains a source of satisfaction for many university staff.

Stress levels were higher for those working high hours, taking work home, working part time, or feeling some insecurity about their employment. Those reporting high stress levels were more likely to be dissatisfied with their job, and feel that their salary did not adequately reflect their job.

Around 60 percent of university staff remain satisfied with their work, much as in 1994. Satisfaction was related to the content of people's work.

Less than half the present university staff expect to be in university employment in 5 years' time.

While slightly more than half of the academics not expecting to be in university employment in 5 years' time expect to have retired by then, more women and those on the lower rungs of the academic ladder or in part-time employment were less positive about their remaining in university work.

5—IMPROVEMENTS AND ISSUES

Work Improvements

Respondents were asked to rank items, in order of importance, from a list of suggested changes to make their job more worthwhile for them. The items ranked first, second, or third by respondents are shown in table 33, with the highest ranked item for each occupational group highlighted.

The 3 top-ranking changes which would make *academics'* work more worthwhile were:

- more time to spend on research or publishing (44 percent),
- decreased workload (25 percent),
- salary increase (23 percent).

For *support staff*, it was:

- salary increase (45 percent),
- better university management (30 percent),
- better job promotion/job security; more professional development (20 percent each).

For *librarians*, it was:

- salary increase (42 percent),
- better equipment/resources (29 percent),
- better department/section management (27 percent).

For *technicians*, it was:

- salary increase (38 percent),
- better equipment/resources (28 percent),
- better promotion system/job security (26 percent).

Table 33

Changes That Would Make Work More Worthwhile Ranked First, Second, or Third by Respondents in 1998

	Academic	Academic and Admin support	Library	Technicians
	N=538 %	N=231 %	N=178 %	N=208 %
More time spent on research/publishing	**44**	5	3	6
Decreased workload	25	18	15	14
Salary increase	23	**45**	**42**	**38**
Better university management	20	30	12	12
Less time on university administration	19	9	4	7
Better promotion system/job security	15	20	26	26
Better equipment/resources	14	14	29	28
Better department/section management	13	19	27	14
More support staff	12	14	11	14
More communication/team work/collegiality	12	19	19	22
Fewer students/smaller classes	7	1	3	2
Better accommodation	6	12	13	13
More job autonomy/challenges	5	18	13	7
More professional development	4	20	8	16

Note—the top-ranking category for each group is in bold type.

Current Issues

Respondents were asked to rank 10 items (if any applied) from a list of major issues at their university that currently concerned them. The items ranked first, second, or third by respondents are shown in table 34 with the highest ranked item for each occupational group shown in bold type.

For *academics* the highest ranked items were:

- management/leadership,
- research funding/time, and
- staff morale.

For *support staff*, it was

- staff morale,
- management/leadership, and
- salaries.

For *librarians*, it was:

- management/leadership,
- staff morale, and
- salaries.

For *technicians*, it was:

- staff morale,
- salaries, and
- management/leadership.

It can be seen that there was a high level of similarity between the occupational groups with regard to the most significant current issues (apart from research/funding time).

Table 34

Current Issues Ranked First, Second, or Third by Respondents in 1998

	Academic	Academic and Admin support	Library	Technicians
	N=538 %	N=231 %	N=178 %	N=208 %
Management/leadership	**42**	51	**46**	30
Research funding/time	40	6	2	11
Staff morale	33	**52**	44	**41**
Staffing levels	28	29	35	26
Student numbers/teaching ratios	25	7	6	12
Promotion/job security	22	34	32	37
Student fees	22	17	15	11
Salaries	17	36	37	39
Accommodation	3	13	8	7

Note—the top-ranking category for each group is in bold type.

Respondents were asked if they had any final comment to make about their workload, level of stress, or changes within their university that had affected them in the last 5 years. Approximately half of each group provided comments, and a sample of those comments is provided in appendix C.

Few of these comments were positive: most contained negative observations about changes to their university, with negative comments by smaller numbers about the changes university staff had seen in the group they worked in, themselves, and the role of education and government policy in education.

Summary

Staff morale and university management are common issues for all university staff. Where general staff are frustrated with their salary levels, academic staff are frustrated that they cannot find time for research.

CONCLUSION

There are many more similarities than differences between 1994 and 1998 in levels of workload and stress amongst New Zealand university staff. It appears that the situation in 1998 reflects a continuation of earlier changes and their effects, rather than the introduction of new changes bringing new impacts. However, the impact of past changes shows no signs of diminishing, and there continue to be more negative than positive effects for staff.

Stress effects on staff had worsened by 1998, in that more staff reported a work-related illness or injury than in 1994. Most staff reported detrimental rather than improved effects on six aspects of their personal, family, and their work life.

For the most part, there were few differences in the 2 years in the following areas: number of hours worked by all groups, percentages of staff who worked in the evenings and the weekends, employment status of most staff, proportion of time spent on various key tasks for occupational groups, the continued increase in work demands, continued dissatisfaction with university restucturing, student numbers and demands, the percentages of staff who found their job stressful, the high stress levels of academic staff, and the percentages of staff who remained satisfied with the content of their work, despite problems with morale. Academic staff continued to be dissatisfied with the lack of time available for research and general staff were dissatisfied with their salaries.

REFERENCES

Abouserie, R. (1996) . Stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction in university academic staff. *Educational Psychology, 16 (1),* 49–56.

Affleck, M.A. (1996). Burnout among bibliographic instruction librarians. *Library and Information Science Research, 18 (2),*165–183.

Blix, A.G., Cruise, R.J., Mitchell, B.M., & Blix, G.G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research, 36 (2),*157–169.

Boyd, S., & Wylie, C. (1994). *Workload and stress in New Zealand universities.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research and The Association of University Staff.

Cassie, F. (1997, July 23). Postgraduate women feel vulnerable. *New Zealand Education Review,* p. 3.

Cassie, F. (1998, July 29). Staff to student ratios worsen at universities. *New Zealand Education Review,* p. 4.

Currie, J. (1996). The effects of globalisation on 1990s: Overworked, stressed out and demoralised. *Melbourne Studies in Education, 37(2),*101–128.

Daniels, K., & Guppy, A. (1994). An exploratory study of stress in a British university. *Higher Education Quarterly, 48(2),*135–144.

Dey, E.L. (1994). Dimensions of faculty stress: A recent survey. *Review of Higher Education, 17(3),*305–322.

Dua, J.K. (1994). Job stressors and their effects on physical health, emotional health, and job satisfaction in a university. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32(1),* 59–78.

Gmelch, W.H., & Burns, J.S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairpersons. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32 (1),* 79–94.

Going casual: Percentage of academic teaching and research staff working in universities on fixed-term or hourly paid contracts. (1998, July 3). *Times Higher Education Supplement,* p. 3.

Gold, K. (1998, July 3). 8.1% of professors are women. *Times Higher Education Supplement,* p. 18.

Hagedorn, L.S. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education, 37 (5),* 569–598.

Harrison, D. (1997). First-degree concern. *People Management, 3 (25),* 36–39.

If you're male and middle-aged you're probably making a mint. (1998, August 5–11). *Campus Review, 8 (29),* 4.

Kinman, G. (1998). *Pressure points: A survey into the causes and consequences of occupational stress in UK academic and related staff.* London: Association of University Teachers.

Leckie, G.J., & Brett, J. (1997). Job satisfaction of Canadian university librarians: A national survey. *College and Research Libraries, 58 (1),* 31–47.

McInnis,C., Powles, M., & Anwyl, J. (1994). *Australian academics' perspectives on quality and accountability.* Melbourne: University of Melbourne, Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

Morrison, A. A. (n.d.). *University research time—what gets in the way.* Unpublished paper. Auckland: University of Auckland, Centre for Professional Development.

Oshagbemi, T. (1998). The impact of age on the job satisfaction of university teachers. *Research in Education, 59,* 95–108.

Sarros, J.C., Gmelch, W.H., & Tanewski, G.A. (1997). *Role stress and satisfaction of academic department heads.* Caulfield East, VIC: Monash University, Faculty of Business and Economics.

Smith, E., Anderson, J.L., & Lovrich, N.P. (1995). The multiple sources of workplace stress among land-grant university faculty. *Research in Higher Education, 36 (3),* 261–282.

Stewart, J.H., & Spence, R. (1996). A new look at factors related to college faculty morale. *Educational Research Quarterly, 20 (3),* 28–40.

Thompson, C.J., & Dey, E.L. (1998). Pushed to the margins: Sources of stress for African American college and university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 69 (3),* 324–343.

Thorsen, E.J. (1996). Stress in academe: What bothers professors? *Higher Education, 31,* 471– 489.

Wergin, J.F. (Ed.). (1994). *Analyzing faculty workload.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

APPENDIX A

Details of Respondents and Additional Tables

Table 35
Sample Population

University	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians		Total	
	1994	1998	1994	1998	1994	1998	1994	1998	1994	1998
Auckland	187	293	121	171	67	75	100	90	475	629
Waikato	82	113	25	36	26	23	22	17	155	189
Massey	153	159	28	39	35	31	67	50	283	279
Victoria	118	113	20	57	33	55	27	29	198	254
Canterbury	111	108	33	60	38	54	59	56	241	278
Lincoln	44	42	12	20	13	10	20	27	89	99
Otago	160	180	30	59	55	58	92	72	337	369
Total	**855**	**1008**	**269**	**442**	**267**	**306**	**387**	**341**	**1778**	**2097**

Table 36
Return Rate by Occupational Group and University

University	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians		Total	
	1994	1998	1994	1998	1994	1998	1994	1998	1994	1998
Auckland	118	126	96	79	46	41	65	43	322	289
Waikato	49	68	12	21	17	15	18	10	96	114
Massey	104	91	18	25	21	20	41	34	184	170
Victoria	76	78	13	25	22	25	20	12	131	140
Canterbury	72	65	21	36	29	38	38	42	160	181
Lincoln	36	24	9	9	10	6	11	19	66	58
Otago	97	88	23	35	39	32	63	48	222	203
Total (n)	**552**	**540**	**192**	**230**	**184**	**177**	**253**	**208**	**1181**	**1155**

Note—1998 academics = 540 as two respondents ticked 2 universities.

Table 37
Ethnicity of Respondents

Ethnicity	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Pakeha/European	93	89	92	87	90	90	95	90
Māori	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	2
Pacific Island	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	-
Asian	2	2	2	2	5	4	-	6
Other	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 38

Gender of Respondents

Gender	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Female	23	36	64	70	80	77	41	41
Male	76	62	35	28	17	22	58	58

Table 39

Age of Respondents

Age	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Less than 20 years	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
21-30 years	2	3	13	12	20	13	15	17
31-40 years	20	19	21	20	26	26	31	33
41-50 years	41	35	42	29	29	29	28	23
51-60 years	33	37	22	33	21	25	23	24
More than 60 years	4	5	1	3	2	4	2	3

Table 40

Academics' Area of Speciality 1998

Location	N=546 %
Arts/humanities	32
Sciences	27
Social sciences	18
Professional (law, architecture, medical, engineering)	13
Commerce	12
Other	1

Note—N = 546 as some respondents selected more than one category.

Table 41

Representativeness by University

University	Return % 1994	Total % 1994	Return % 1998	Total % 1998
Auckland	27	26	25	28
Waikato	8	9	10	9
Massey	16	16	15	14
Victoria	11	11	12	12
Canterbury	14	14	16	14
Lincoln	6	5	5	5
Otago	19	19	17	18
Total	101*	100	100	100

* Note—due to rounding this percentage does not total 100.

Table 42

Representativeness by Gender

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1998		1998		1998		1998	
Gender	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %	Return %	Total %
Female	36	37	70	56	77	82	41	30
Male	62	63	28	44	22	18	58	70
Total	98	100	98	100	99	100	99	100

Note—where respondents did not specify their gender, percentages do not total 100.

Table 43

Gender and Academic Positions

Position	Female %	Male %
Professor	13	11
Associate professor	13	19
Senior lecturer	28	39
Lecturer	26	18
Assistant lecturer	3	2
Senior tutor	4	4
Tutor	8	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 44a

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Increases in Workload Areas

Area	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Course/lecture planning	65	50	*	*	*	*	*	*
Support/services to students	64	59	49	43	58	56	*	*
Administration/meetings	63	66	51	51	43	49	53	49
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	47	45	*	*	*	*	*	*
Postgraduate supervision	44	47	*	*	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	38	35	*	*	*	*	*	*
Research/writing/publishing	27	31	*	*	*	*	16	17
Consultation/professional services	14	25	*	*	*	*	34	35
Professional development	15	16	34	25	42	36	35	26
Other areas	12	11	32	39	20	31	24	31
Student marking and evaluation	x	54	x	*	x	*	x	*
Mentoring other staff	x	39	x	*	x	*	x	*
Peer review of research proposals	x	30	x	*	x	*	x	*
Support/services to staff	*	*	59	54	42	40	*	*
Technical or computer services	*	*	*	31	*	*	*	*
Instruction/induction	*	*	23	22	25	30	*	*
Support/services to external clients	*	*	34	35	27	30	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	*	54	53	*	*
Word-processing	*	*	*	x	*	*	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	*	x	*	*	*	*
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	*	*	47	52
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	*	*	43	42
General technical services	*	*	*	*	*	*	42	35
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	*	*	45	43

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

x denotes categories not included that year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 44b

Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Workload Areas

Area	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	37	38	*	*	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	36	35	*	*	*	*	*	*
Professional development	36	41	31	34	31	39	29	38
Research/writing/publishing	32	32	*	*	*	*	12	20
Postgraduate supervision	30	28	*	*	*	*	*	*
Consultation/professional services	29	28	*	*	*	*	24	26
Support/services to students	28	33	18	15	15	22	*	*
Administration/meetings	26	23	32	26	36	35	25	34
Course/lecture planning	24	37	*		*		*	
Student marking and evaluation	x	31	x	*	x	*	x	*
Mentoring other staff	x	26	x	*	x	*	x	*
Peer review of research proposals	x	33	x	*	x	*	x	*
Support/services to external clients	*	*	36	25	31	31	*	*
Support services to staff	*	*	22	18	33	37	*	*
Technical or computer services	*	*	*	16	*		*	*
Instruction/induction	*	*	16	17	17	15	*	*
Word-processing	*	*	*	x	*	*	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	*	x	*	*	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	*	26	28	*	*
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	*	*	33	38
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	*	*	30	31
General technical services	*	*	*	*	*	*	28	29
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	*	*	23	26
Other areas	15	21	18	19	17	30	16	27

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 44c

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Decreases in Workload Areas

Area	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Professional development	36	27	16	11	5	11	6	13
Research/writing/publishing	35	28	*	*	*	*	6	6
Consultation/professional services	11	9	*	*	*	*	1	1
Contact teaching (undergraduate)	9	10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Contact teaching (postgraduate)	8	7	*	*	*	*	*	*
Administration/meetings	6	6		2	1	4	2	3
Postgraduate supervision	5	7	*	*	*	*	*	*
Course/lecture planning	4	6	*	*	*	*	*	*
Support/services to students	2	3	5	4	5	4	*	*
Student marking and evaluation	x	7	x	*	x	*	x	*
Mentoring other staff	x	3	x	*	x	*	x	*
Peer review of research proposals	x	4	x	*	x	*	x	*
Technical or computer services	*	*	3	3	*		*	*
Instruction/induction	*	*	3	2	2	1	*	*
Support/services to external clients	*	*	2	1	2	2	*	*
Support/services to staff	*	*	1	1	2	1	*	*
Word-processing	*	*	4	x	*	*	*	*
Non-contact library duties	*	*	*	*	4	5	*	*
Financial management/budgeting	*	*	1	x	*	*	*	*
Technical support for research	*	*	*	*	*	*	8	13
Technical support for teaching	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	5
Equipment maintenance	*	*	*	*	*	*	5	4
General technical services	*	*	*	*	*	*	3	4
Other areas	3	3	1	-	-	2	1	1

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.

Table 45a

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Improvement in Work Situation in Last 4 Years

	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
Quality of	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Resources/equipment	49	46	60	64	75	67	54	51
Services provided	*	*	67	x	71	x	59	x
Instruction/teaching	43	x	*	x	42	x	*	x
Admin/organisation in area	36	32		41	40	29	33	35
Research	32	*	*	x	*	x	*	x
Interactions with students	28	26	29	30	43	34	27	33
Work environment (space/light)	27	27	35	36	53	38	28	37
Student evaluations of teaching	27	27	*	*	*	*	*	*
Interactions with colleagues	19	22	41	37	42	35	38	31
Interactions with outside clients	19	21	23	28	20	22	22	21
Interactions with other uni. staff	18	18	38	38	36	34	34	30
Performance reviews/appraisals	15	20	20	20	34	19	22	20
Working life in general	14	12	23	26	32	26	25	20
Overall university management	12	7	14	13	17	10	11	11
IT support	x	46	x	35	x	46	x	31
Secretarial/admin support	x	21	x	*	x	*	x	*
University library	x	25	x	*	x	*	x	*
Other areas								
Career/promotion prospects	16	15	14	16	18	17	17	14
Level of funding for research	16	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Method of funding for research	9	12	*	*	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	8	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Method of funding for teaching	6	4	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	5	6	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ability to exercise academic freedom	4	5	*	*	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for area	*	*	21	7	29	12	14	10
Method of funding for area	*	*	8	9	7	7	8	14

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 45b

Percentage of Respondents Reporting No Change in Work Situation in Last 4 Years

Quality of	Academic		Academic or Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Work environment (space/light)	47	53	36	47	19	41	40	36
Services provided	*	x	13	x	11	x	19	x
Student evaluations of teaching	47	52	*	*	*	*	*	*
Interactions with other uni. staff	44	53	43	42	40	49	45	50
Interactions with students	41	50	35	38	29	42	46	47
Interactions with colleagues	39	45	38	41	33	46	42	44
Performance reviews/appraisals	36	43	39	39	35	46	43	45
Interactions with outside clients	28	30	44	44	34	35	37	45
Instruction/teaching	28	x	*	x	10	x	*	x
Admin/organisation in area	27	26	23	26	26	26	32	31
Research	26	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Resources/equipment	26	26	24	19	9	15	25	17
Overall university management	21	22	27	20	31	17	28	20
Working life in general	18	24	29	28	25	30	32	31
IT support	x	23	x	27	x	22	x	19
Secretarial/admin support	x	46	x	*	x	*	x	*
University library	x	39	x	*	x	*	x	*
Other areas								
Ability to exercise academic freedom	56	53	*	*	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for teaching	49	42	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	45	46	*	*	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	39	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Career/promotion prospects	35	33	49	39	48	40	42	38
Method of funding for research	34	32	*	*	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for research	32	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Level of funding for area	*	*	28	23	21	12	28	15
Method of funding for area	*	*	39	26	34	27	39	21

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.

Table 45c

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Deterioration in Work Situation in Last 4 Years

Quality of	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Working life in general	60	54	41	37	32	34	40	42
Service provided	*	x		x	14	x	21	x
Overall university management	47	53	37	46	25	38	38	45
Interactions with colleagues	36	28	17	25	18	10	17	17
Interactions with other uni. staff	30	22	16	11	8	4	17	13
Admin/organisation in area	29	35	27	24	21	29	30	28
Interactions with students	26	17	10	5	12	6	14	10
Work environment (space/light)	24	18	25	12	23	17	34	27
Resources/equipment	22	25	16	13	15	14	24	27
Interactions with outside clients	15	9	5	4	11	6	6	10
Performance reviews/appraisals	7	8	19	19	9	18	17	20
Student evaluations of teaching	7	9	*	*	*	*	*	*
IT support	x	20	x	17	x	22	x	14
Secretarial/admin support	x	30	x	*	x	*	x	*
University library	x	27	x	*	x	*	x	*
Other areas								
Level of funding for research	38	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Method of funding for research	38	38	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ability to take research leave	36	33	*	*	*	*	*	*
Level of funding for teaching	35	x	*	x	*	x	*	x
Career/promotion prospects	33	37	24	26	23	26	29	37
Ability to exercise academic freedom	27	32	*	*	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for teaching	18	40	*	*	*	*	*	*
Method of funding for area	*	*	19	33	16	30	23	38
Level of funding for area	*	*	30	46	26	58	42	60

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.
x denotes categories not included that year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 46
Balance of Workload

Preference for use of time	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
More research	79	74	*	*	*	*	30	32
Less teaching	25	22	*	*	*	*	5	9
More teaching	10	7	*	*	*	*	10	6
Less research	-	-	*	*	*	*	2	-
More professional service	*	*	*	19	*	*	*	*
More technical service	*	*	*	10	*	*	*	*
Less professional service	*	*	*	3	*	*	*	*
Less technical service	*	*	*	3	*	*	*	*
More non-contact/general service	*	*	*	*	14	20	25	16
Less non-contact/general service	*	*	*	*	4	3	4	7
More user contact	*	*	*	*	25	21	*	*
Less user contact	*	*	*	*	6	4	*	*
Other/not sure	5	1	*	10	8	3	6	4

* denotes categories that are not common to all occupational groups.

Table 47
Percentage of Respondents Receiving Adequate Training

Training area	Academic		Academic and Admin support		Library		Technicians	
	1994 N=552 %	1998 N=538 %	1994 N=192 %	1998 N=231 %	1994 N=184 %	1998 N=178 %	1994 N=253 %	1998 N=208 %
Everyday requirements of job	56	61	60	68	76	84	66	70
New technology/computers/ equipment	37	43	43	36	46	46	29	36
New job responsibilities	33	37	38	42	47	58	37	45
New admin/procedure requirements	21	29	31	39	36	40	28	32
E-mail/Internet use	x	56	x	55	x	76	x	50
Health and safety, e.g., OOS	x	43	x	55	x	79	x	54
Changes in research funding	x	34	x	4	x	6	x	11
University restructuring and devolution	14	20	15	17	15	22	11	17

x denotes categories not included that year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Questionnaires

SECTION A - OCCUPATIONAL DETAILS

Type [ ]
Code [ ]

1. Please indicate your occupation:

☐ a) General administration ☐ b) Secretarial/support officer ☐ c) Technician ☐ d) Librarian

2. Are you employed in a section serving the university as a whole?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No - work for specific department/faculty/school only ☐ c) No - other

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

_____

3. Which university are you located at (or attached to)?

☐ a) Auckland ☐ b) Waikato ☐ c) Massey ☐ d) Victoria
☐ e) Canterbury ☐ f) Lincoln ☐ g) Otago

4. Please indicate the total length of time you have spent in university employment:

☐ a) 0-5 yrs ☐ b) 6-10 yrs ☐ c) 11-20 yrs ☐ d) 21-30 yrs ☐ e) 31+ yrs

5. How long have you been in your *present* position?

☐ a) Less than 1 yr ☐ b) 1-2 yrs ☐ c) 3-4 yrs ☐ d) 5-6 yrs
☐ e) 7-8 yrs ☐ f) 9+ yrs

6. Has your section *changed* in size (EFTS) since 1994?

☐ a) large increase ☐ b) small increase ☐ c) no change ☐ d) small decrease ☐ e) large decrease
☐ f) don't know

7. If the size of your department has changed, what is the reason for the change?
(please tick all boxes that apply)

☐ a) Restructuring ☐ b) Change in full-time enrolments
☐ c) Change in part-time enrolments ☐ d) Change in student preferences
☐ e) Other _____

f 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

8. Are you employed by your university:

☐ a) Full-time **or** ☐ b) Part-time

9. Are you employed on a permanent or limited-term contract?

☐ a) Permanent ☐ b) Limited-term ☐ c) Other (please describe)

d 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

_____
_____
_____

If you are employed on a limited-term contract, please go to question 11.

10. If you are a permanent/tenured staff member, have you ever been employed on a limited-term contract as an academic?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure ☐ d) Not applicable

If you are not employed on contract, please go to question 14 below

11. If you are employed on a limited-term contract, what is the term of your contract?

☐ a) 0-5 months ☐ b) 6-11 months ☐ c) 1-2 years ☐ d) 3-4 years ☐ e) more than 4 years
☐ f) Not applicable ☐ g) Other (please describe)_____

12. How long have you been employed on contract(s)?

☐ a) 1 year or less ☐ b) 2-3 years ☐ c) 4-5 years ☐ d) 6 years or more

13. How many contracts have you had?

☐ a) 1 ☐ b) 2 ☐ c) 3 ☐ d) 4+

14. For how many hours a week are you employed?

_____ Hours per week

15. What is the average number of *actual* hours you spend on university-related work per week?

☐ a) 0-9 hrs ☐ b) 10-19 hrs ☐ c) 20-29 hrs ☐ d) 30-34 hrs ☐ e) 35-39 hrs
☐ f) 40-44 hrs ☐ g) 45-49 hrs ☐ h) 50-54 hrs ☐ i) 55-59 hrs ☐ j) 60-64 hrs
☐ k) 65-69 hrs ☐ l) 70+ hrs

16. Do you ever work in the evenings or take work home (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - on 3 or more evenings a week ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a week
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a month ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a term/semester
☐ e) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a year ☐ f) Never

17. Do you work in the weekends (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - most weekends ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a month
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a term/semester ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a year
☐ e) Never

18. What is the average number of hours you spend working at/from home on university work per week?

☐ a) 0 ☐ b) 1-9 hrs ☐ c) 10-19 hrs ☐ d) 20-29 hrs ☐ e) 30-34 hrs
☐ f) 35-39 hrs ☐ g) 40-44 hrs ☐ h) 45-49 hrs ☐ i) 50-54 hrs ☐ j) 55-59 hrs
☐ k) 60-64 hrs ☐ l) 65-69 hrs ☐ m) 70+ hrs

SECTION B - INTERACTIONS WITH OTHERS

(For the purposes of this questionnaire include those attending continuing education classes, summer schools, or recreation centre classes as students whether undergraduates or postgraduates.)

1. Approximately how many *student* requests do you deal with per day on average?

☐ a) None ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40
☐ f) 41-50 ☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71+

2. Approximately how many *staff* requests do you deal with per day on average?

☐ a) None ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40
☐ f) 41-50 ☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71+

3. Do you provide consultations, liaison, information, or professional services for individuals or organizations outside the university?

☐ a) No ☐ b) 1 or 2 a term ☐ c) 1 or 2 a month
☐ d) 1 or 2 a week ☐ e) 1 or 2 a day ☐ f) More than 1 or 2 a day

4. Please indicate if the number of requests you deal with from the following groups has changed in recent years (since 1994):

	Large increase (a)	Small increase (b)	No change (c)	Small decrease (d)	Large decrease (e)	Varies (f)	Not sure (g)	Not sure (h)
a) Student requests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Staff requests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Outside requests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. If the number of requests you deal with from students, staff and outside individuals or organizations has increased since 1994, has this had an impact on your workload?

☐ a) No impact ☐ b) Increased my workload ☐ c) Decreased my workload
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

6. Do you give presentations or formal instruction to *undergraduate* classes in the year?

☐ a) No ☐ b) Yes: _____ Seminars/sessions per year

7. Do you give presentations or formal instruction to *postgraduate* classes in the year?

☐ a) No ☐ b) Yes: _____ Seminars/sessions per year

8. What is the *minimum* number of students you instruct/assist or provide technical support for any 1 course or class (if more than 1 stream per class indicate the total number of students in the class):

☐ a) Do not teach ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40 ☐ f) 41-50
☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71-80 ☐ j) 81-90 ☐ k) 91+

9. What is the *maximum* number of students you instruct/assist or provide technical support for any 1 course or class (if more than 1 stream per class indicate the total number of students in the class):

☐ a) Do not teach ☐ b) 1-20 ☐ c) 21-40 ☐ d) 41-60 ☐ e) 61-80 ☐ f) 81-100
☐ g) 101-200 ☐ h) 201-300 ☐ i) 301-400 ☐ j) 401-500 ☐ k) 501+

10. Has the number of students you instruct/assist or provide technical support for overall changed in recent years (from 1994 onwards)?

☐ a) Increased - large amount ☐ b) Increased - small amount ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Decreased - small amount ☐ e) Decreased - large amount ☐ f) Varies from year to year
☐ g) Not sure ☐ h) Not applicable

11. If the number of students you instruct/assist or provide technical support to has increased, has this had an impact on your workload?

☐ a) No impact ☐ b) Increased my workload ☐ c) Decreased my workload
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

12. Do you contribute to any induction or staff training courses during the year?

☐ a) No ☐ b) Yes: _____ Courses per year

13. Did you have the opportunity to take part in any staff development yourself in the last 12 months?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

14. Did you take part in any staff development in the last 12 months?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

SECTION C - WORKLOAD

The next question applies only to ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT STAFF (including clerical and secretarial):

If you are a LIBRARIAN, please go to question 2, on the green sheet
If you are a TECHNICIAN, please go to question 3, on the yellow sheet

1. Please indicate the proportion of your work time you spend, on average per year, on the following key areas (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Professional services/planning/liaison/information provision for students, staff and 6outsiders

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

b) Technical/computer services or development

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

c) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

d) Other areas

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

If you have been in your current job for less than 6 months please go to question 6, page 10.

Please indicate whether your workload in the following areas has *changed* in recent years (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

e) Professional services/planning/liaison/information provision for *students* (excluding formal teaching)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

f) Professional services/planning/liaison/information provision for *staff* (excluding formal teaching)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

g) Professional services/planning/liaison/information provision for *outside individuals/organizations* (excluding formal teaching)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

h) Technical/computer services or development

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

i) Formal instruction of students and staff (including planning and evaluating)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

j) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

k) Professional development/reading/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

l) Any other areas of your work

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

m) How do you view the balance of time you spend on providing professional services, technical services and administration?

(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) Prefer more professional service time
☐ b) Prefer less professional service time
☐ c) Prefer more technical service time
☐ d) Prefer less technical service time
☐ e) Prefer more administration time
☐ f) Prefer less administration time
☐ g) Content with the balance
☐ h) Not sure
☐ i) Other
☐ j) Not applicable

Please go to question 4, p10.

FOR LIBRARIANS ONLY:

2. Please indicate the proportion of your work time you spend, on average per year, on the following key areas (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) General non-contact library duties

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

b) Contact with users (student, staff and outside requests)

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

c) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

d) Other areas

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

If you have been in your current job for less than 6 months please go to question 6, page 10.

Please indicate whether your workload in the following areas has *changed* in recent years (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

e) General non-contact library duties

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

f) User service - *students*

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

g) User service - *university staff* (other than library)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

h) User service - *individuals or organizations outside the university*

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

i) Planning and teaching bibliographic instruction classes for students and staff

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

j) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

k) Professional development/reading/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

l) Other areas

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

m) How do you view the balance of time you spend on customer contact, general non-contact duties, and administration?
(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) Prefer more user contact time ☐ b) Prefer less user contact time
☐ c) Prefer more non-contact duties time ☐ d) Prefer less non-contact duties time
☐ e) Prefer more administration time ☐ f) Prefer less administration time
☐ g) Content with the balance ☐ h) Not sure
☐ i) Other ☐ j) Not applicable

Please go to question 4, p10.

FOR TECHNICIANS ONLY:

3. Please indicate the proportion of your work time you spend, on average per year, on the following key areas (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Providing technical support/assistance for *teaching*

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

b) Providing technical support/assistance for *research*

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

c) Providing *general* technical services (e.g., electrical, photographic or audiovisual services)

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

d) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

e) Other areas

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

If you have been in your current job for less than 6 months please go to question 6, page 10.

Please indicate whether your workload in the following areas has *changed* in recent years (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

f) Providing technical support/assistance for *teaching*

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

g) Providing technical support/assistance for *research*

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

h) Providing *general* technical services (e.g., audiovisual, stores)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

i) Equipment maintenance

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

j) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

k) Consultation/professional services

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

l) Professional development/reading/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

m) Research/writing/publishing

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

n) Other areas

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

o) How do you view the balance of time you spend on administration and providing teaching, research or general technical services?

(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) Prefer more research time ☐ b) Prefer less research time
☐ c) Prefer more teaching time ☐ d) Prefer less teaching time
☐ e) Prefer more general service time ☐ f) Prefer less general service time
☐ g) Prefer more administration time ☐ h) Prefer less administration time
☐ i) Content with the balance ☐ j) Not sure
☐ k) Other ☐ l) Not applicable

Please go to question 4, next page.

4. Do you think your workload has changed in *total* since 1994?

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

If your workload has not changed please go to question 6 below.

5. What do you think the changes (if any) to your work situation are due to?
(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) A change in job position
☐ b) Working with different colleagues
☐ c) Increases in student numbers
☐ d) Decreases in student numbers
☐ e) Student population more diverse
☐ f) More individual student tuition
☐ g) Increase in quality of students work
☐ h) Decreases in quality of students work
☐ i) New or increased job responsibilities
☐ j) Decreases in job responsibilities
☐ k) Changes to area/department funding
☐ l) Organisational changes in area/department
☐ m) Requirements of new legislation
☐ n) Changes in overall university management
☐ o) Changes to reporting/output requirements
☐ p) Changes due to Employment Contracts Act
☐ q) New/changed buildings/work spaces
☐ r) New/changed equipment
☐ s) Not sure what caused changes
☐ t) No changes noticed
☐ u) University restructuring
☐ v) Reduction in academic staff levels
☐ w) Reduction in general staff levels
☐ x) More student counselling/pastoral care
☐ y) Semesterization
☐ z) Working as head of department
☐ aa) Mentoring other staff
☐ ab) Devolution of administration
☐ ac) Changing research funding environment
☐ ad) Other (please describe)

_____ ac 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

6. Do you expect the level of your workload to change in the next 3 years?

☐ a) Increase ☐ b) Decrease ☐ c) Stay about the same ☐ d) Not sure

SECTION D - CHANGES TO YOUR WORK SITUATION

1. Have you noticed any changes in the last 4 years to the following areas of your work?
(If you have not worked in your job for longer than 4 years, have you noticed any changes to the following since you started your job?)

a) The quality of the resources/equipment you work with

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of IT support for your work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of your work environment (space, lighting etc.)

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your interactions with colleagues

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

e) The quality of your interactions with other university staff

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

f) The quality of your interactions with students

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

g) The quality of your interactions with users or people outside the university (e.g. consultancy, information provision)

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

h) The quality of the administration, organisation, and planning in your work area

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

i) The quality of management within your university

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

j) The level of funding for your area of work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

k) The method of funding for your area of work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

l) Your career prospects/promotion opportunities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

m) The standard of performance reviews and appraisals of your work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

n) The quality of your working life in general

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

2. Do you feel you have been given enough on the job training to adequately cope with:

	Yes (a)	No (b)	Not sure (c)	Not applicable (d)
a) The everyday requirements of your job	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) New job responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) New technology/computers/equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) E-mail/Internet use	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) New administration and procedure requirements	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) University restructuring and devolution	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Health and safety e.g. OOS	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Changes in research funding	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. What do you see as the major impacts (if any) on your work of the changes to university structure and management since 1994?

a 1 2 3

4 5 6

7 8 9

b 1 2 3

4 5 6

7 8 9

4. If your work situation has changed in any way has this had any effect on:

a) The quality of the service(s) you provide

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of your instruction/teaching

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of your physical health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your emotional health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

e) The quality of your family life/relationships

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

f) The quality of your leisure activities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

SECTION E - STRESS AND WORK PRESSURES

1. Do you find your job stressful?

☐ a) Almost never ☐ b) Sometimes ☐ c) Often ☐ d) Almost always

2. Do you feel your job has become more or less stressful in recent years?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful ☐ f) New to job

3. Do you expect your job to become more or less stressful in future?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful

4. Are you generally satisfied with your job?

☐ a) Yes - very satisfied ☐ b) Yes - satisfied ☐ c) Neutral
☐ d) No - dissatisfied ☐ e) No - very dissatisfied ☐ f) Not sure

5. Do you feel that your job has become more or less satisfying in recent years?

☐ a) Much more satisfying ☐ b) More satisfying ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less satisfying ☐ e) Much less satisfying ☐ f) New to job
☐ g) Not sure

6. Have you ever suffered from a work-related injury or stress illness while working in a New Zealand university?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

7. If yes please describe:

☐ a) General stress effects (eg insomnia) ☐ b) RSI/OOS
☐ c) Back pains ☐ d) Serious illness (eg heart attack)
☐ e) Psychological illness ☐ f) General illness/feeling run down
☐ g) Work-related accidents ☐ h) Reaction to traumatic event at work
☐ i) Other

Please describe: _____ j 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

8. Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

(Comment:)

_____ d 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

9. Please rate how often you find the following workload, and work-related, factors a source of stress or pressure, using the key below:

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

		0	1	2	3	4	5
a)	Overall level of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b)	Irregularity of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c)	Interruptions to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d)	Deadlines/demands	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e)	Lack of recognition for work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f)	Lack of feedback about work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g)	Lack of clarity of job position/description/role	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h)	Lack of job security	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i)	Personal motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j)	Professional development/reading/training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k)	Internal administration/meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l)	Student numbers/class sizes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m)	Lack of job autonomy/freedom	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n)	Lack of promotion/career prospects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o)	Performance appraisals of your work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p)	Peer review	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q)	Level of funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r)	Method of funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s)	Staffing levels in your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t)	Support staff time available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u)	IT support available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
v)	Availability of relieving staff for your job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
w)	Your working space	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x)	Equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
y)	Relations with students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
z)	Relations with those supervised	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
za)	Relations with supervisors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zb)	Relations with colleagues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zc)	Relations with outsiders (e.g. users)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zd)	Semesterization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ze)	Devolution	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zf)	Department/section organisation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zg)	University management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zh)	University climate/morale	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zi)	University redundancies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zj)	Continual change	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

		0	1	2	3	4	5
For general administrative/support staff only							
zk)	Professional services/information for students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zl)	Professional services/information for staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zm)	Professional services/information for outsiders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zn)	Technical/computing services or development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
For librarians only							
zo)	General non-contact library duties	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zp)	User service - students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zq)	User service - staff (other than library)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zr)	User service - outsiders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zs)	Bibliographic instruction (students/staff)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
For technicians only							
zt)	Providing support/assistance for teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zu)	Providing support/assistance for research	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zv)	Providing general technical services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zw)	Equipment maintenance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
zx)	Formal instruction of students/staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. If you could change aspects of your job to make it *more* worthwhile for you, what would these be?
Please rank the following in order of importance to you: 1=highest, 2=second highest etc.

☐ a) Better accommodation
☐ b) Better equipment/resources
☐ c) Better university management
☐ d) Better department/section management
☐ e) Less time on university administration
☐ f) More support staff
☐ g) Better promotion system/job security
☐ h) Salary increase
☐ i) Decreased workload
☐ j) More communication/teamwork/collegiality
☐ k) More time spent on research/publishing
☐ l) Fewer students/smaller classes
☐ m) More job autonomy/challenge
☐ n) More professional development

11. What are the major issues (if any) at your university that currently concern you?
Please rank the following in order of importance to you: 1=highest, 2=second highest etc.

☐ a) Management/leadership
☐ b) Student fees
☐ c) Promotion/job security
☐ d) Salaries
☐ e) Student numbers/teaching ratios
☐ f) Staff morale
☐ g) Staffing levels
☐ h) Accommodation
☐ i) Research funding/time
☐ j) Other (please describe)

k 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9
_____

SECTION F - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your age:

☐ a) 20 or less ☐ b) 21-30 ☐ c) 31-40 ☐ d) 41-50 ☐ e) 51-60 ☐ f) 61-65 ☐ g) 66+

2. Your gender:

☐ a) Female ☐ b) Male

3. Please indicate the ethnic group(s) you belong to:

☐ a) Pakeha/European ☐ b) Maori ☐ c) Pacific Island ☐ d) Asian
☐ e) Other (please describe)

f 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
7 8 9

4. Please indicate how much you are paid:

☐ a) Less than $10,000 ☐ b) $ 10,001 - 20,000 ☐ c) $ 20,001 - 30,000 ☐ d) $ 30,001 - 40,000
☐ e) $ 40,001 - 50,000 ☐ f) $ 50,001 - 60,000 ☐ g) $ 60,001 - 70,000 ☐ h) $ 70,001 - 80,000
☐ i) $ 80,001 - 90,000 ☐ j) $ 90,001 - 100,000 ☐ k) $100,001 - 110,000 ☐ l) $110,001 - 120,000
☐ m) $120,001+

5. Do you think you will be in university employment in 5 years' time?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

6. If No, will you be retiring?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

7. Do you receive employer contributions to one of the following superannuation schemes?

☐ a) GSF ☐ b) NPF ☐ c) NZUSS ☐ d) Other ☐ e) No

8. Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

Thank you very much for your time in completing this questionnaire.

Please return it to NZCER, PO Box 3237, Wellington, in the Freepost envelope provided by *Monday 8 June*.

University Academics

SECTION A - OCCUPATIONAL DETAILS

Type [ ]
Code [ ]

1. Please indicate your position:

☐ a) Professor ☐ b) Associate professor ☐ c) Senior lecturer
☐ d) Lecturer ☐ e) Assistant lecturer ☐ f) Senior tutor
☐ g) Tutor ☐ h) Other (please specify)_____

2. Please indicate your area of speciality:

☐ a) Arts and humanities ☐ b) Sciences ☐ c) Social sciences
☐ d) Professional (eg law, architecture, medicine, engineering) ☐ e) Commerce
☐ f) Other (please specify)_____

g 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

3. Which university are you located at (or attached to)?

☐ a) Auckland ☐ b) Waikato ☐ c) Massey ☐ d) Victoria
☐ e) Canterbury ☐ f) Lincoln ☐ g) Otago

4. Please indicate the total length of time you have spent in university employment:

☐ a) 0-5 yrs ☐ b) 6-10 yrs ☐ c) 11-20 yrs ☐ d) 21-30 yrs
☐ e) 31+ yrs

5. How long have you been in your *present* position?

☐ a) Less than 1 yr ☐ b) 1-2 yrs ☐ c) 3-4 yrs ☐ d) 5-6 yrs
☐ e) 7-8 yrs ☐ f) 9+ yrs

6. Has your department *changed* in size (EFTS) between 1994 and 1998?

☐ a) large increase ☐ b) small increase ☐ c) no change
☐ d) small decrease ☐ e) large decrease ☐ f) don't know

7. If the size of your department has changed, what is the reason for the change?
(please tick all boxes that apply)

☐ a) Restructuring ☐ b) Change in full-time enrolments
☐ c) Change in part-time enrolments ☐ d) Change in student preferences
☐ e) Other _____

8. Are you employed by your university:
(For medical academics: if you work on a proportional basis for your university please indicate part-time):

☐ a) Full-time **or** ☐ b) Part-time

9. Are you employed on a permanent or limited-term contract?

☐ a) Permanent/tenured ☐ b) Probation/tenure track ☐ c) Limited-term ☐ d) Other (please describe)
_____

If you are employed on a limited-term contract, please go to question 11.

10. If you are a permanent/tenured staff member, have you ever been employed on a limited-term contract as an academic?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure ☐ d) Not applicable

If you are not employed on contract, please go to question 14.

11. If you are employed on a limited-term contract, what is the term of your contact?

☐ a) 0-5 months ☐ b) 6-11 months ☐ c) 1-2 years ☐ d) 3-4 years ☐ e) more than 4 years
☐ f) Not applicable ☐ g) Other (please describe)_____

h 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

12. How long have you been employed on contract(s) as an academic?

☐ a) 1 year or less ☐ b) 2-3 years ☐ c) 4-5 years ☐ d) 6 years or more

13. How many contracts have you had as an academic?

☐ a) 1 ☐ b) 2 ☐ c) 3 ☐ d) 4+

14. What is the average number of hours you spend on university-related work per week?

☐ a) 0-9 hrs ☐ b) 10-19 hrs ☐ c) 20-29 hrs ☐ d) 30-34 hrs
☐ e) 35-39 hrs ☐ f) 40-44 hrs ☐ g) 45-49 hrs ☐ h) 50-54 hrs
☐ i) 55-59 hrs ☐ j) 60-64 hrs ☐ k) 65-69 hrs ☐ l) 70+ hrs

15. Do you ever work in the evenings or take work home (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - on 3 or more evenings a week ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a week
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a month ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a term/semester
☐ e) Yes - on 1 or 2 evenings a year ☐ f) Never

16. Do you work in the weekends (excluding shift work/rostered duties)?

☐ a) Yes - most weekends ☐ b) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a month
☐ c) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a term/semester ☐ d) Yes - on 1 or 2 weekends a year
☐ e) Never

17. What is the average number of hours you spend working at/from home on university work per week?

☐ a) 0 ☐ b) 1-9 hrs ☐ c) 10-19 hrs ☐ d) 20-29 hrs ☐ e) 30-34 hrs
☐ f) 35-39 hrs ☐ g) 40-44 hrs ☐ h) 45-49 hrs ☐ i) 50-54 hrs ☐ j) 55-59 hrs
☐ k) 60-64 hrs ☐ l) 65-69 hrs ☐ m) 70+ hrs

18. Are you currently undertaking postgraduate study in order to advance your career?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No

SECTION B - STUDENT/STAFF INTERACTIONS AND INSTRUCTION

1. What is the *minimum* number of undergraduates you teach in any 1 internal or external course (if more than 1 stream per course indicate the total number of students in the course):

☐ a) Do not teach ☐ b) 1-10 ☐ c) 11-20 ☐ d) 21-30 ☐ e) 31-40 ☐ f) 41-50
☐ g) 51-60 ☐ h) 61-70 ☐ i) 71-80 ☐ j) 81-90 ☐ k) 91+

2. What is the *maximum* number of undergraduates you teach in any 1 internal or external course (if more than 1 stream per course indicate the total number of students in the course):

☐ a) Do not teach ☐ b) 1-20 ☐ c) 21-40 ☐ d) 41-60 ☐ e) 61-80 ☐ f) 81-100
☐ g) 101-200 ☐ h) 201-300 ☐ i) 301-400 ☐ j) 401-500 ☐ k) 501+

3. Has the number of students you teach overall changed in recent years (from 1994 onwards)?

☐ a) Increased - large amount ☐ b) Increased - small amount ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Decreased - small amount ☐ e) Decreased - large amount ☐ f) Varies from year to year
☐ g) Not sure ☐ h) Not applicable

4. **If the number of students you teach has increased, has this had an impact on your workload?**

☐ a) No impact ☐ b) Increased my workload ☐ c) Decreased my workload
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

5. **How many courses/papers do you have overall responsibility for this year?** _____ Courses per year

6. **How many *undergraduate* courses/papers do you lecture/give tutorials/labs for this year (including extramural)?** _____ Courses per year

7. **How many *postgraduate* lectures, tutorials, seminars or classes in total will you give this year?**
_____ Lectures/seminars per year

8. **How many *postgraduate* students (honours, MA, PhD, diploma etc.) do you currently supervise projects or theses for?** _____ Students

9. **In term/semester time how many hours on average do you spend on *direct contact teaching* per week?**
_____ Undergraduate hours per week _____ Postgraduate hours per week

10. **In term/semester time how many hours on average do you spend on graduate supervision?**
_____ Hours

11. **Do you contribute to any induction or staff training courses during the year?** _____ Courses per year

12. **Did you have the opportunity in the last 12 months to take part in any staff development focused on teaching?**

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

13. **Did you take part in the last 12 months in any staff development focused on teaching?**

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

SECTION C - WORKLOAD

1. **Please indicate the proportion of your work time you spend, on average per year, on the following key areas (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):**

a) Teaching (planning/evaluating/in-class time/supervising/student queries)

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

b) Research/writing/publishing

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

c) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

d) Other areas (e.g., clinical work)

☐ a) 1-10 % ☐ b) 11-20 % ☐ c) 21-30 % ☐ d) 31-40 % ☐ e) 41-50 %
☐ f) 51-60 % ☐ g) 61-70 % ☐ h) 71-80 % ☐ i) 81 % + ☐ j) Not part of workload

If you have been in your current job for less than 6 months please go to question 5, page 5.

2. Please indicate whether your workload in the following areas has *changed* since 1994 (including work from extramural courses and summer schools):

a) Undergraduate contact teaching

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

b) Postgraduate contact teaching

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

c) Postgraduate supervision

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

d) Student queries/counselling

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

e) Course and lecture planning/study guide development

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

f) Student marking and evaluation

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

g) Mentoring other staff

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

h) Research/writing/publishing

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

i) Peer review of research proposals

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

j) Consultancies/professional services

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

k) Professional development/reading/training

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

l) Internal administration/meetings

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

m) Other areas (e.g. clinical work)

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not part of workload

3. Do you think your workload has changed in *total* since 1994?

☐ a) Increased ☐ b) Decreased ☐ c) Stayed about the same
☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

If your workload has not changed please go to question 5, below.

4. What do you think the changes (if any) to your work situation are due to?
(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) A change in job position
☐ b) Working with different colleagues
☐ c) Increases in student numbers
☐ d) Decreases in student numbers
☐ e) Student population more diverse
☐ f) More individual student tuition
☐ g) Increase in quality of students work
☐ h) Decreases in quality of students work
☐ i) New or increased job responsibilities
☐ j) Decreases in job responsibilities
☐ k) Changes to area/department funding
☐ l) Organisational changes in area/department
☐ m) Requirements of new legislation
☐ n) Changes in overall university management
☐ o) Changes to reporting/output requirements
☐ p) Changes due to Employment Contracts Act
☐ q) New/changed buildings/work spaces
☐ r) New/changed equipment
☐ s) Not sure what caused changes
☐ t) No changes noticed
☐ u) University restructuring
☐ v) Reduction in academic staff levels
☐ w) Reduction in general staff levels
☐ x) More student counselling/pastoral care
☐ y) Semesterization
☐ z) Working as head of department
☐ aa) Mentoring other staff
☐ ab) Devolution of administration
☐ ac) Changing research funding environment
☐ ad) Other (please describe)

_____ 40 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

5. Do you expect the level of your workload to change in the next 3 years?

☐ a) Increase ☐ b) Decrease ☐ c) Stay about the same ☐ d) Not sure

6. How do you view the balance of time you spend on teaching, research and administration?
(Please tick all boxes that apply.)

☐ a) Prefer more teaching time
☐ b) Prefer less teaching time
☐ c) Prefer more research time
☐ d) Prefer less research time
☐ e) Prefer more administration time
☐ f) Prefer less administration time
☐ g) Content with the balance
☐ h) Not sure
☐ i) Not applicable
☐ j) Other

_____ k 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

SECTION D - CHANGES TO YOUR WORK SITUATION

1. **Have you noticed any changes in the last 4 years to the following areas of your work?**
   (If you have not worked in your job for longer than 4 years, have you noticed any changes to the following since you started your job?)

a) The quality of the resources/equipment you work with

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of IT support for your work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of secretarial/administration support

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of the university library

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

e) The quality of your work environment (space, lighting etc.)

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

f) The quality of your interactions with colleagues

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

g) The quality of your interactions with other university staff

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

h) The quality of your interactions with students

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

i) The quality of your interactions with clients outside the university (e.g. consultancy work)

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

j) The quality of the administration, organisation, and planning in your department

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

k) The quality of management within your university

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

l) The method of funding for your teaching work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

m) The method of funding for your research work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

n) Your career prospects/promotion opportunities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

o) Your ability to exercise academic freedom

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

p) Your ability to take advantage of research leave

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

q) The standard of student evaluations of your teaching

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

r) The standard of performance reviews and appraisals of your work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

s) The quality of your working life in general

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

2. Do you feel you have been given enough training on the job to adequately cope with:

	Yes (a)	No (b)	Not sure (c)	Not applicable (d)
a) The everyday requirements of your job	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) New job responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) New technology/computers/equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) E-mail/Internet use	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) New administration and procedure requirements	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) University restructuring and devolution	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Health and safety e.g. OOS	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Changes in research funding	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. What do you see as the major impacts (if any) on your work of the changes to university structure and management since 1994?

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4. If your work situation has changed in any way has this had any effect on:

a) The quality of your teaching

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

b) The quality of your research work

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

c) The quality of your physical health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

d) The quality of your emotional health

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

e) The quality of your family life/relationships

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

f) The quality of your leisure activities

☐ a) No change ☐ b) Improved ☐ c) Deteriorated ☐ d) Not sure ☐ e) Not applicable

SECTION E - STRESS AND WORK PRESSURES

1. Do you find your job stressful?

☐ a) Almost never ☐ b) Sometimes ☐ c) Often ☐ d) Almost always

2. Do you feel your job has become more or less stressful in recent years?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful ☐ f) New to job

3. Do you expect your job to become more or less stressful in future?

☐ a) Much more stressful ☐ b) More stressful ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less stressful ☐ e) Much less stressful

4. Are you generally satisfied with your job?

☐ a) Yes - very satisfied ☐ b) Yes - satisfied ☐ c) Neutral
☐ d) No - dissatisfied ☐ e) No - very dissatisfied ☐ f) Not sure

5. Do you feel that your job has become more or less satisfying in recent years?

☐ a) Much more satisfying ☐ b) More satisfying ☐ c) About the same
☐ d) Less satisfying ☐ e) Much less satisfying ☐ f) New to job
☐ g) Not sure

6. Have you ever suffered from a work-related injury or stress illness while working in a New Zealand university?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

7. If yes please describe:

☐ a) General stress effects (eg insomnia) ☐ b) RSI/OOS
☐ c) Back pains ☐ d) Serious illness (eg heart attack)
☐ e) Psychological illness ☐ f) General illness/feeling run down
☐ g) Work-related accidents ☐ h) Reaction to traumatic event at work
☐ i) Other

_____ j 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

8. Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

(Comment:)_____ d 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9

9. Please rate how often you find the following workload, and work-related, factors a source of stress or pressure, using the key below:

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

		0	1	2	3	4	5
a)	Contact teaching (undergraduate)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b)	Contact teaching (postgraduate)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c)	Postgraduate supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d)	Student queries/counselling	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e)	Course/study guide planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f)	Marking students' work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g)	Research/writing/publishing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h)	Consulting/professional services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i)	Professional development/reading/training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j)	Internal administration/meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k)	Student numbers/class sizes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l)	Overall level of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m)	Irregularity of workload	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n)	Interruptions to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o)	Lack of recognition for work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p)	Lack of feedback about work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q)	Deadlines/demands	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r)	Devolution	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s)	Personal motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t)	Clarity of job position/description/roles	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u)	Lack of job security	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
v)	Lack of job autonomy/academic freedom	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
w)	Lack of promotion/career prospects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
x)	Student appraisals of your work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
y)	Level of teaching funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
z)	Level of research funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

0 - Not applicable
1 - Never a source of stress or pressure
2 - Rarely a source of stress or pressure
3 - Sometimes a source of stress or pressure
4 - Often a source of stress or pressure
5 - Always a source of stress or pressure

		0	1	2	3	4	5
aa)	Method of teaching funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ba)	Method of research funding for your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ca)	Lack of time for reading/research	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
da)	Staffing levels in your area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ea)	Support staff time available to you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
fa)	IT support or access available to you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ga)	Availability of relieving staff for your job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ha)	Office/work/teaching space	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ia)	Equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ja)	Relations with students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ka)	Relations with those supervised	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
la)	Relations with supervisors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ma)	Relations with colleagues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
na)	Relations with outside clients	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
oa)	Peer review	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
pa)	Performance appraisal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
qa)	Department/section organisation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ra)	Department/section management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
sa)	Semesterization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ta)	Continual change	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ua)	University management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
va)	University climate/morale	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
wa)	University redundancies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. If you could change aspects of your job to make it *more* worthwhile for you, what would these be?
Please rank the following in order of importance to you: 1=highest, 2=second highest etc.

- ☐ a) Better accommodation
- ☐ b) Better equipment/resources
- ☐ c) Better university management
- ☐ d) Better department/section management
- ☐ e) Less time on university administration
- ☐ f) More support staff
- ☐ g) Better promotion system/job security
- ☐ h) Salary increase
- ☐ i) Decreased workload
- ☐ j) More communication/teamwork/collegiality
- ☐ k) More time spent on research/publishing
- ☐ l) Fewer students/smaller classes
- ☐ m) More job autonomy/challenge
- ☐ n) More professional development

11. What are the major issues (if any) at your university that currently concern you?
Please rank the following in order of importance to you: 1=highest, 2=second highest etc.

- ☐ a) Management/leadership
- ☐ b) Student fees
- ☐ c) Promotion/job security
- ☐ d) Salaries
- ☐ e) Student numbers/teaching ratios
- ☐ f) Staff morale
- ☐ g) Staffing levels
- ☐ h) Accommodation
- ☐ i) Research funding/time
- ☐ j) Other (please describe)

k 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9
_____

SECTION F - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your age:

☐ a) 20 or less ☐ b) 21-30 ☐ c) 31-40 ☐ d) 41-50 ☐ e) 51-60 ☐ f) 61-65 ☐ g) 66+

2. Your gender:

☐ a) Female ☐ b) Male

3. Please indicate the ethnic group(s) you belong to:

☐ a) Pakeha/European ☐ b) Māori ☐ c) Pacific Island ☐ d) Asian
☐ e) Other (please describe)

f 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
7 8 9

4. Were you born in New Zealand?

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No

5. **Where was your final degree obtained?**

☐ a) New Zealand ☐ b) Australia ☐ c) UK ☐ d) USA ☐ e) Canada
☐ f) Europe ☐ g) Asia ☐ h) Other _____

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

6. **Please indicate how much you are paid:**

☐ a) Less than $10,000 ☐ b) $ 10,001 - 20,000 ☐ c) $ 20,001 - 30,000 ☐ d) $ 30,001 - 40,000
☐ e) $ 40,001 - 50,000 ☐ f) $ 50,001 - 60,000 ☐ g) $ 60,001 - 70,000 ☐ h) $ 70,001 - 80,000
☐ i) $ 80,001 - 90,000 ☐ j) $ 90,001 - 100,000 ☐ k) $100,001 - 110,000 ☐ l) $110,001 - 120,000
☐ m) $120,001+

7. **Do you think you will be in university employment in 5 years time?**

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

8. **If No, will you be retiring?**

☐ a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐ c) Not sure

9. **Do you receive employer contributions to one of the following superannuation schemes?**

☐ a) GSF ☐ b) NPF ☐ c) NZUSS ☐ d) Other ☐ e) No

10. **Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?**

a 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
b 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
c 1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9

Thank you very much for your time in completing this questionnaire.

Please return it to NZCER, PO Box 3237, Wellington, in the Freepost envelope provided by *Monday 8 June*.

APPENDIX C

Selected comments from respondents to open-ended questions

(i) Academics

What do you see as the major impacts (if any) on your work of the changes to university structure and management since 1994?

Inability to detect origin/direction of change makes planning difficult. Decision makers seem faceless and not accountable, this has an adverse effect on loyalty to the institution. Extra demands to pursue funding swallow up large amounts of time.

Have worked as an academic, then as general staff as teaching consultant, and then as an academic again. The biggest change is the increased time spent dealing with administrative/managerial issues, which often have little to do with teaching or research. Classic job intensification!

More reports, more reports, "accountability" transaction costs ignored.

As a Māori academic I am required by my job description to promote M āori development. The university system gives a liberal response publicly to wanting this to progress, actual institutional responses are more conservative and reactionary.

New courses are being introduced without adequate staffing and support. There is also uncertainty because of the change in senior management plus the government policy on tertiary education seems to be under change. All this creates a level of stress which is largely unnecessary.

Addition of extra layers of management with different areas of responsibility has increased demands for reports and data on performance, along with the number of meetings. These severely reduce research time and have began to impact on quality of teaching.

Loss of collegiality. Business-minded orientation vs learning.

Semesterization has really more than doubled my workload and exponentially meant my student consultations have increased. More papers I have mounted have resulted in more work regarding preparation. We are told to push postgraduate but little incentive to do so.

More attention to quality of teaching currently more consumer orientated—what does the student need? Quality control mechanisms more comprehensive, staff more accountable. Generally changes have had positive impact. Greater pressure to produce published work.

More demand for reporting and auditing mean less time for other things—research and research student supervision have suffered particularly, undergrad teaching not so much.

More students. More students with problems. More marking. Less support.

Immense. Membership of a large number of new and old committees. Application of trendy 'management' practices; greater centralisation of executive power and decision making; despite lipservice to collegiality HODs are in an intolerable position.

Research: the change in funding type has forced a significant revaluation of the area and general thrust of the research in my area of interest. There is now a need for the short-term answer i.e. applied research rather than strategic or basic.

Teaching: the students "demand" question—focussed teaching rather than a more speculative "grand-view" or "over-view". These are greater demands on their time (need to have a supplementary income) so that they will only focus on work at crisis times i.e. exams, assignment date etc. A greater demand for good teaching at all levels.

Ineffective leadership at the management level. No commitment by management to academic outputs. More focussed on fiscal outputs.

The changes at this university from departments to schools and from faculties to colleges has left many of us feeling like very small fish in very large ponds. The vice-chancellor has a favourite phrase "well, if you don't like the conditions you don't have to stay!"

Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

I think the leadership role in all aspects of academic life and professional activities, when successfully achieved, is not rewarded sufficiently in international terms by the salary range for professors.

Nobody thinks they are paid too little! The real question is whether there is objective evidence of underpayment. In my area (finance) people with my skills in the private sector earn vastly more. This doesn't trouble me, but it does cost the university sector in NZ a lot of potential talent.

Compared with the average kiwi, I am lucky but compared with fashionable jobs (managers, CEOs, consultants etc) I feel underpaid.

If my skill levels were applied in the private sector my salary would not be adequate.

By international standards we are paid a pittance. I am a senior lecturer.

We are much better paid than most sectors of the workforce; it's not a matter of wanting more money but more time, less pressure.

Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

It is definitely a high stress job, would not recommend it to most people.

Māori academics are still pioneering developments. This notion is barely recognised, not equitably resourced, not even appreciated!

We have launched a stream of new degrees which mean more small courses hence more teaching. This university has not got rid of the under performers though restructuring now makes it easier to identify them—the rest of us have to carry them. Increased pressure to publish is apparent resulting in increased volume and/or published in obscure journals and less relevant to making a contribution to NZ society.

I don't feel stressed or overworked—this is a very satisfying job. In part, this is because I stay away from admin. However, bureaucratic bloat in Registry worries me—I would rather see the money used to increase academic salaries in areas where we lose or never get people because salaries are not competitive with the private sector.

Despite the increased workload (especially in the teaching and admin areas) I have improved my techniques in minimising their impacts on my well being and interest. However, I would willingly forego teaching and administration time to increase the opportunities to indulge in research and develop consultancy opportunities for the community at large.

The biggest problems and sources of stress in my job are an inability to compete with CRIs to get PGSF research funds—I can't get funding to attract high quality Ph.D students. This is particularly a problem for attracting international students who can't afford full international fees. Then there is management at a departmental level. We don't have anyone with the vision or drive to really develop and improve our department.

Too many decisions are being taken by managers who are out of touch with the students, and the classroom situation. Inappropriate management models have been formed from "business" and applied to a service vocation. Funds are spent on risky international ventures while library resources are cut back.

Problems relate to:

- new style university management;
- inadequate funding of both teaching and research;
- more time spent on often unproductive paperwork;
- pressures to adopt new styles of teaching that are not necessarily advantageous.

Changes to student funding have changed student attitudes towards education. There appears to be an "I've paid for it, therefore I want a pass" attitude which makes it harder to fail students. Some become quite confrontational. Also, at our university, the increased number (up to 20 percent) of overseas students in commerce places greater pressures on staff because English is a second language and many students have trouble and expect extra help with written skills. The promotion system also seems like a marathon race with ever moving goal posts. Extra/equitable (with professions) pay rates would go along way towards making things better!

I feel the workload has increased tremendously. It appears as if for the same amount of return, I need to do more and more.

I believe stress levels are no worse than other environments I have worked in. In industry, secondary school teaching, and polytechs I believe life is tougher than in the university environment.

My concerns are not really addressed here in this questionnaire:

- the micro-climate;
- the lack of system funding;
- the devolution of the system;
- the pressure students are under because of loans.

I have a real concern that funding for research will be available to fewer and there will be separation of "teachers" and "researchers"—most undesirable. The government is directing research at universities already—academic freedom is being eroded. These matters are far more important than most issues addressed in this survey.

I am in what I perceive as the high stress, low pay, low support, low job security and development area of university work—tutoring.

Student numbers have risen. Staff numbers have not risen. Admin tasks have risen. University has been made to run as a profit-making organisation, not an educational institution. Collegiality has given way to competition between universities, between faculties between departments, between courses, between staff—all largely because of inadequate funding by a government with short-term right-wing views about education. Bad departmental decisions have not been adequately corrected by management, so bad departmental management now jeopardises solid research and excellent teaching in favour of glossy, faddish course redevelopment.

Hard to switch between teaching/writing and hard to juggle parent of a young family, spouse, lecturer, author, columnist and consultant roles. I have almost no leisure e.g. not time even to see children playing soccer etc.

I am becoming frustrated with the expectation that we will meet demands no matter how unreasonable or how many hours are involved. I am also the principal income earner in a family

with two adolescent children. At times it is extremely difficult to balance work demands and family life. At times stress has reached intolerable levels. A little bit of acknowledgement would go a long way! I get this from the students in the form of excellent teaching evaluations. However, the university appears not to value this aspect of our work!

Well, it isn't all the university's fault, to be fair. There are all those 'mid-life' things that come along—losing one's parents, losing one's spouse, letting go of one's children, the deaths of friends and colleagues, ever-increasing mortgage rates, physical ailments, surgery, broken sleep, fatigue— these take a tremendous toll on one's energy and confidence, yet we are expected to 'perform' every day, be bright and breezy, as if our private life were somehow detached from our professional life. I have missed promotions, had rows with my HOD, been lumbered with courses I hate, spent entire weekends marking, etc., but I do believe I could have cruised through all these difficulties and disappointments were it not for the sorrows and hardships of my private life. We are people first, academics second.

(ii) Technicians

What do you see as the major impacts (if any) on your work of the changes to university structure and management since 1994?

Deteriorating working conditions due to budget constraints.

The increase in computer technology.

Increased workload. Unwillingness of management to employ more staff (esp. technicians and support staff) to provide adequate services.

The standardising of levels within general staff—started off well with the feeling your workload and quality of your work was going to be appreciated, and then the final step, for people who were re-graded to a higher level, was the salary round which was a joke as the university said there was no money.

More undergraduate work with the same or diminished number of technical workers.

Far more admin and paper work than ever before.

Have taken on responsibilities once assigned to staff members now retired and not replaced.

Required to become multi skilled in many areas to make up for the shortfall in funding.

Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

Salary has not reflected increases in teaching output (greater than drops in research workloads).

Management haven't got a clue as to the value of my services to the department.

Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

Spreading workload of those general staff on parental leave on to remaining staff is not a "good employer" process. A fund should exist to put replacement staff into positions when staff are on parental leave.

Lack of support for the increase in technology. We are now computer technicians as well as everything else. We are also expected to repair and maintain equipment we have little training in.

Workload up. Stress up. Support in these areas from colleagues working alongside is exceptional but no feeling of support at other levels. Job content although extra busy is still interesting and stimulating, just harder to get motivated/excited about work when it is such a rush all the time. No one ever says thank you because they're all stressed out too.

Better training would help to prepare for changes that occur in teaching and admin. Also recognition of a job well done would help to keep spirits up.

A lack of leadership and good management practices across the board. Poor involvement and encouragement of staff in decisions that affect them. Lots of talking and writing reports etc. not much listening or doing.

Loss of staff by natural attrition has meant an increase in workload and responsibilities for me. There is pressure to do outside contract work in department time to subsidise loss of income through cut backs in the budget. Repairs to working space walls/water cylinders etc. often are not carried out due to lack of funding in the service divisions. Quality of work has to be compromised to meet all these new demands.

An environment of total uncertainty about long-term employment prospects.

(iii) Support Staff

What do you see as the major impacts (if any) on your work of the changes to university structure and management since 1994?

Reduced funding for student services resulting in a policy of not replacing staff who leave, yet we face increased demand (already heavy) for student services. Also with semesterization there is no let-up in service demand.

Stress loads on other staff make interactions more difficult. Harder to get things done, more counselling of staff. Lower morale and willingness in the university. General cynicism of staff makes my job working with them harder.

Devolutions mean major changes for a service which hasn't devolved—there for all faculties.

More stress tension and conflict because of lack of clarity about roles, expectations and responsibility within a structure, i.e. no clear picture of the structure so that lines of accountability and responsibility are accessible when things go wrong. More things do not seem to go smoothly. There is more conflict in my workplace.

Devolution of IT is a complete nightmare—who to ring? will they be competent e.g. have knowledge of Macs? Lack of (ie. reduced) funding to university as a whole leading to no or insufficient extra staff to handle increased workloads due to larger student numbers and greater complexity and diversity of computer access available to staff and students.

Changes affecting my work environment are implemented without effective consultation—reflect "high level" agendas but not "coalface" issues.

Upper management is very isolated from other staff—seem unaware of the effect of management decisions and statements on morale.

Lip service paid to "quality", but resourcing restraints have a direct effect on ability to provide quality service.

Funding impacts directly on the quality of equipment I am responsible for, and lack of funding causes extra work and problems maintaining obsolete equipment.

Devolution of responsibilities/purchasing etc. to departments. Lack of decent management tools at department level. Lack of central intelligent leadership. Very little "for the good of the university as a whole" projects.

Inserting a new layer of highly paid managers.

Much clearer lines of communication.

Semesterization and cuts in funding.

Staff in general are dissatisfied and as an consequence, as support administrative, I am aware of this in the attitude of staff when contacting me for information. There are more temporary contracts and staff are not sure of their jobs any longer.

My role is student adviser—I am having to assist students coping with increasing stress levels due to semesterization (structure change), and increasing debt (a result of government policies); and respond to the devolution of administration work from Registry. My role requires further improvements to time management.

Lines of communication have become blurred. I feel avenues for advancement have been closed down. Feel decisions affecting me are made in a autocratic manner.

Job is quite specialised in terms of knowledge, pay should reflect that. We have high staff turnover.

We have lost 2 custodians, not replaced. More buildings built. We are told to pick up more areas for same wage.

Disillusionment with what we were promised 4½ years ago.

When one has problems you go and tell the EEO office and then the HOD and nothing changes. I can't believe such inadequate people can hold some of these positions. The reasons they survive is there is no accountability—they can write or say what they like and put themselves up on a pedestal and no one cares if it is indeed true or not. Morale will never be great until staff start seeing management addressing these issues. Staff feel like what is the use.

I find that a lot of sick colleagues would stay off work for a day and feel obligated to return the next day although they may still be sick. But the other side of the coin is that staff would have to cover for the staff away on sick leave—we need to find a balance!! or measures could be put in place for management to recognise this and deal with it in a productive way for all staff.

In my job I find the biggest frustration is the lack of communication. Also when we reach the top in our grade there is no further promotion which makes you feel, why should I put that little bit extra into the university.

My job has been more enjoyable and fulfilling than any other job I have had—until recent times. Since devolution to faculty level, and divisional re-structuring, it is very difficult to have confidence in the management of faculty and job security is at an all-time low. Staff morale currently very poor.

Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

Just reading the job ads in the papers puts similar jobs at $15-20K above the upper limit of my range—with no glass ceiling.

The university, which asks for top applicants with Hons degrees in my area, pays at the rate of significantly below the bottom 10 percent range of base salary in two different industry surveys. And this was before any extra benefits/payments that others could earn.

Not when compared with the whole university.

Compared with similar positions in business or in education it is lower.

Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

Stress on students (e.g. fees, obligations to earn rather than study) and numbers of students creates stress on our service. We should have had increased staffing not decreased.

University staff are a lot less happier than they were a few years ago.

New director who is very good at management has improved working conditions—he is from private sector and is very good manager—previous manager was an academic and university was supposed to train managers, but he did not function well as a manager—what does this say about university training of managers?

We have had to do our own restructuring and use our own energy against a huge bureaucratic machine (the university). It took one year to get some shelves built, months to get some jobs redefined.

The major problem is the constant restructuring. You never know who to turn to for information etc. And management specifying out intellectual and academic concerns for "efficiency gains" etc.

Lack of salary increases of significance as job security has been reduced — when security has in the past often been used as a reason to deny salary increases or competitive salaries.

Increased workload due to lack of increases in staff, but more and more complex systems to manage, maintain and support.

Semesterization has affected my workload and stress in the past couple of years.

(iv) Library Staff

What do you see as the major impacts (if any) on your work of the changes to university structure and management since 1994?

Pressure to provide necessary services to students and staff without having the real resources to do so. Budget reduction for books/periodicals; departmental redundancies and budget reduction forcing departments to off-load their student information request on to the library—new courses being introduced by the university without provision for library, and of course every year there has been an increase in student numbers.

Attrition; increased projects with money spent on equipment, not staff positions; overspending at the university has meant major funding cuts for last 2 years—no overtime paid; demoralised staff means high turnover, means positions constantly vacant and hard to fill; very low wages for IT staff.

Repeated restructuring. I am now being restructured for the fourth time in as many years.

Demand to keep up with new technology. Need to continually upgrade own skills without formal training within normal working hours.

There is pressure all the time for performance and output. If this pressure is on a supervisor it permeates through all the department and creates unnecessary stress.

"Professional" roles are also 'down-graded' slowly. Why earn a masters degree in library science!? Everyone is to do everything now.

Not enough IT support.

Not enough funds to buy books, computers, new buildings to cope with increase in student numbers. No vision in management decisions—delays over decision on new campus means at my level of work we cannot plan services and money is being wasted in duplicating resources and services.

Lack of change (and especially lack of planning and adaptation to changing external

environment) at the University level has hindered the library. Careful consideration of and adoption of new management techniques and planning mechanisms by the university librarian has made my work better.

Do you think your salary adequately reflects the demands of your job?

Being in a department which is on the frontline so to speak I would like to see greater appreciation for the staff who work directly with the main 'clientele' of this university—providing efficient courteous service is not always easy given the current management philosophy of this university.

I supervise tech support staff. I manage a NT network of servers and 400 PCS which provides e-mail/Internet and connectivity to NZBN (New Zealand Bibliographic Network) and a comprehensive CDRom network. I get paid $37,000 gross (very gross) What do you think??

Library skills are generally undervalued and poorly paid.

Hasn't keep pace with the changing skills e.g. technology required for the job.

I feel the pay is good for the duties involved and level of responsibility.

Librarians are underpaid and overworked.

Managers with little or no management skills, lacking communication skills and recognition of employees' work.

No one is trusting of the leadership of this university.

Are there any final comments you wish to make about your workload, level of stress, or changes within your university that have affected you in the last few years?

Management of this university have actively promoted themselves as cold ruthless managers who prefer to follow their own private agendas than to even listen to the concerns and protestations of those whom they are 'managing'. They lack communication skills and compassion, two necessary components for any administrator esp those in charge of large numbers of staff. People have been shocked by the contempt expressed publicly by the management of any group who opposes them, even in any small matter, and their often ill-thought schemes and scams. Loyalty to the university does not extend to the management anymore.

University management make all sorts of wonderful decisions about innovations, which will be good when completed, but they expect it all to be done by existing staff who are already overworked. We have 4 positions in my office. We have had full staffing for 40 percent of the

last 2 years.

Its not so much the changes themselves that cause difficulty but rather the pace of change. The lack of support and constant developments in particularly the IT area leave little time for professional development or forward planning.

Stress is part of work. Management of, and identification of how stress affects an individual at various times are the issues. We all should have training to deal with it. It should be an issue that is "out" as a matter of good health and staff management.

Having been in the commercial environment, to me the stress is average. Staff can still take half an hour tea breaks, loads of meetings (constructive)? Academic staff can take school holidays off to look after children. It is a busier environment with technology however not nearly as intense as the commercial world.

In recent years the management of the university have spent too much on promoting the university, and acquiring the latest technology, and not enough on the human element. General staff tend to be extremely knowledgeable in their fields and also very conscientious. The management gives no recognition of this and appears to treat staff with contempt. A prime example of this is the computerisation of the library without providing adequate IT experts to support the system. Many hours and weeks are spent in "down" time, which is utterly frustrating for staff and students. This wasted time must cost the university more than a few extra salaries would.